GOVERNMENT OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

+ + + + +

ZONING COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

----:

IN THE MATTER OF:

6000 New Hampshire Avenue. N.E. - : Case No. 05-30

West*Group Development Company : LLC and The Jarvis Company :

----:

Thursday, July 20, 2006

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case No. 05-30 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m., in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., 20001, Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN Chairperson

ANTHONY J. HOOD Vice-Chairperson

GREGORY JEFFRIES Commissioner

JOHN PARSONS Commissioner (NPS)

MICHAEL G. TURNBULL Commissioner (AOC)

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

JOEL LAWSON KAREN THOMAS JENNIFER STEINGASSER

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

The transcript constitutes the minutes from the public hearing held on July 20, 2006.

A-G-E-N-D-A

	Ра	.ge	NO.
Call to Order, CAROL MITTEN		•	. 4
Preliminary Matters, SHARON SCHELLIN	•	•	7
Report by the Applicant,			
NORMAN M. GLASGOW, JR			.12
ED JARVIS			. 16
GEOFF FERRELL			. 24
ARTHUR LOHSEN			
STEVEN SUEN			
EDWARD PAFAZIAN			
Report of Office of Planning, KAREN THOMAS			. 95
Report of Persons and Organizations in Suppo	ort		
KEITH WHITE, Lamond Community Action Group		•	108
Report of Parties in Opposition			
YVONNE JEFFERSON, Citizens Aware Block Org.			
LAWRENCE MARTIN	•	•	120
Report of Individuals in Opposition			
DR. ORALISA MARTIN			128
PAMELA GRIFFIN			131
WILLARD JOHNSON			133
JUDI JONES			136
RODNEY FOXWORTH, Lamond-Riggs Citizens Assoc			148
DR. AVIS KELLY			153
TERRY R. GOINGS	•	•	156
GLORIA I. MOBLEY			
FLOYD SMITH			167
Adjourn		•	171

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

6:46 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a public hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia for Thursday, July 20, 2006. My name is Carol Mitten, and joining me this evening are Vice Chairman Anthony Hood, and Commissioners Mike Turnbull, John Parsons and Greg Jeffries is here, but he's not in his seat at the moment.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning Commission Case No. 05-30. This is a request by West*Group Development Company LLC and The Jarvis Company for approval of a consolidated planned unit development and related map amendment for property bounded by Rittenhouse Street, New Hampshire Avenue, Peabody Street, Chillum Place and Sligo Mill Road, known as Lot 74 in Parcel 126, Lots 69 through 73, 801, 824 and 826, in Square 3714, and Lot 858 in Square 3719, in Northeast Washington.Notice of today's hearing was published in the D.C. Register on April 28, 2006, and copies of that hearing announcement are available to you, they are on the table by the door.

This hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR, Section

3022, and those are the Rules of Procedure for Contested Cases. The order of procedure this evening will be as follows. First, we'll take up any preliminary matters, followed by the presentation of the Applicant's case, the report by the Office of Planning, reports of other government agencies, the report of the affected Advisory Neighborhood Commission, and in this case it's 4B, organizations and persons in support, and organizations and persons in opposition.

The following time constraints will be maintained in the hearing. The Applicant will have 50 minutes, organizations will have five minutes and individuals will have three minutes. The Commission intends to adhere to these time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time.

The Commission reserve the right to change the time limits for presentations if necessary, and note that no time shall be ceded from one individual to another.

All persons appearing before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. These are what the witness cards look like. These cards are also on the table by the door, also. When you come

1 forward to speak to the Commission, please give both 2 cards to the reporter who is sitting to our right. 3 Please be advised that this proceeding is 4 being recorded by the court reporter, and is also 5 being webcast live. Accordingly, we ask you to refrain from making any disruptive noises in the 6 7 hearing room. When presenting information to the 8 Commission, please turn on and speak into the 9 10 microphone, first stating your name and address. 11 When you are finished speaking, please 12 turn off the microphone so that it's no longer picking 13 up any background noise. The decision of the Commission in this 14 15 case must be based exclusively on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary, the 16 17 Commission requests that persons present not engage the members of the Commission in conversation during 18 19 a recess or at any other time. Ms. Schellin will be 20 available throughout the hearing to answer any 21 procedural questions that you might have. 22 I'd ask that you turn off all beepers and 23 cell phones at this time, so as not to disrupt the 24 hearing. 25 Now, we'll take up any preliminary

1 matters. 2 Ms. Schellin? 3 SECRETARY SCHELLIN: Just the ANC's request 4 and the party status requests that you have before 5 you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Let's take up 6 7 the request for party status to begin. We have one request for party status, and 8 9 this is from the Citizens Aware Block Organization, 10 represented by Yvonne Jefferson, and the report was 11 timely filed, and it meets the requirements for party 12 status, inasmuch as the individuals involved appear to 13 be directly affected by the development, being in 14 close proximity to the subject property. 15 And, I would move that we grant party status to the Citizens Aware Block Organization. 16 17 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Second. 18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any discussion? 19 All those in favor please say aye. 2.0 (Ayes.) 21 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Any opposed? 22 Ms. Schellin? MS. SCHELLIN: Yes, staff will record the 23 24 vote 5-0-0 to grant party status to the Citizens Aware 25 Block Organization, Commissioner Mitten moving,

1 Commissioner Hood seconding, Commissioners Jeffries, 2 Parsons and Turnbull in favor. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 3 We did also have a request from the ANC 4 5 that they had taken a vote to request that the Commission postpone this hearing, rather than move 6 7 forward, because they have been unable to take a 8 position. Rather than do that, what we would like to 9 propose is, since it's unlikely that we'll get through 10 11 the entire hearing this evening, is that we would move 12 the ANC to the end of the agenda, which will likely 13 roll over to another evening, so that we can hear from 14 as many of you that are present tonight, take the ANC 15 last. The night that we -- who is here 16 17 representing the ANC? Who is the Chair of the ANC, 18 you are the designated representative. Could I get 19 you at the table, please, and maybe Mr. Glasgow, too, 20 or Ms. Freeman, if you would. Whatever one is fine, 21 just state your name for the record, please. You need 22 to turn on the microphone for me. MS. WHITING: Good evening, Cherita 23 24 Whiting, Chair of ANC 4B. 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. What we were

1 going to propose is that you all would have an 2 additional opportunity if we were to have a second 3 session of the hearing, so that you could have another 4 meeting of your ANC, take an official position, having 5 all of the material that's in the record available to 6 you. 7 And, we happen to have an availability before we take our August break, which is, we had a 8 hearing fall off our schedule, which would be Monday, 9 10 July 31st, and I believe your next meeting is Thursday 11 the 27th. 12 MS. WHITING: Yes. 13 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Would you be able to 14 return to us with at least having attempted to reach 15 a position? MR. GLASGOW: Madam Chair, I'll be out of 16 17 town. 18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Well, you see 19 what we are trying to do, do you have an alternative 2.0 to suggest? 21 MR. GLASGOW: Well, I know a lot of the 22 dates in the fall are taken up. I mean, we certainly 23 want to get this done as quickly as possible, as does 24 the Commission, but the plans I made to be out of town 25 were made a good while ago.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand. I
2	understand.
3	Do we have anything in September?
4	MS. SCHELLIN: Our next available would be
5	in December.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Hold on one second.
7	We have a hearing on September 7th, that
8	I don't think will take too much time. Would
9	September 7th work for you, Ms. Whiting?
10	MS. WHITING: With the Commissioners, all
11	I have to do is give them advance notice, and then get
12	a response back, and if the majority is okay with it
13	then it would be fine.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Well, we have
15	to set the time tonight.
16	MS. WHITING: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The date tonight.
18	MS. WHITING: Okay, so since the 31st
19	doesn't work, I will take the September 7th date back
20	to the Commission, and we can set the time now, and I
21	can give that to the Commissioners.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
23	MS. WHITING: And, any who feel that they,
24	you know, definitely want to be heard, or be a part of
25	the hearing, will show up.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. You can
2	designate someone else if you are not available then.
3	MS. WHITING: Okay.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: For that night.
5	Does that work for you, Mr. Glasgow?
6	MR. GLASGOW: Yes.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That works. Okay.
8	So, what we'll do is, we'll get through as
9	much of this as we can tonight, but then the Applicant
10	will bring their witnesses back, so that you will have
11	the opportunity, both to put on your report, but also
12	after having the benefit of all of the material that's
13	in the record you can ask cross examination questions
14	at that time. So, you can do that tonight or you can
15	reserve all of that until the 7th of September.
16	MS. WHITING: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: All right?
18	MS. WHITING: Thanks a lot.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'll call on you
20	periodically to see if you have any cross examination
21	questions as we go through the case.
22	MS. WHITING: Thank you very much.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Okay, great, so
24	we'll get through as much of this as we can this
25	evening, but we will have the ANC report on the 7th of

1	September, and anyone who is not able to be here
2	tonight, or if you have to leave early, we'll take you
3	then on the 7th, and that will be at 7:30. We have a
4	hearing at 6:30 that we'll try to get through in an
5	hour.
6	Okay, I think those were Mr. Glasgow, did you
7	have any preliminary matters?
8	MR. GLASGOW: No, I do not.
9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, great.
10	Then I'd ask anyone who is planning on
11	testifying this evening, I'd like you to stand now,
12	raise your right hand, and Ms. Schellin will
13	administer the oath.
14	Anyone who is planning on testifying this
15	evening, Ms. Schellin is over here. Anyone else who
16	is planning on testifying, this is the time to get
17	sworn in. Okay.
18	Ms. Schellin.
19	(Whereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Why don't you go ahead
21	and get started.
22	MR. GLASGOW: Okay.
23	Good evening, Members of the Commission.
24	For the record, my name is Norman M. Glasgow, Jr., of
25	the law firm of Holland & Knight, here on behalf of

the Applicant, 6000 New Hampshire Avenue, LLC, which is comprised of the West*Group Development LLC and The Jarvis Company LLC, for approval of a planned unit development at the subject property along New Hampshire Avenue, between Peabody Street and Rittenhouse Street, N.E.

Here with me today are Mr. Bill Jarvis, Mr. Ernie Jarvis, and Mr. Stan Vondrie, on behalf of the ownership, the master plan architects, and architects of the project, Mr. Geoff Ferrell of Ferrell Madden Associates, who was submitted as an expert witness, Mr. Art Lohsen, Franck, Lohsen, McCrery Architects, who was submitted as an expert in residential architecture, and Mr. Steven Suen, expert in land use planning. We also have available for questions Mr. Rob Jeter, who is a Civil Engineer, Mr. Ed Pafazian, who is a Traffic Engineer, and Scott Mingonet. Mr. Pafazian is submitted as an expert in traffic engineering, and Mr. Jeter in civil engineering, and Mr. Mingonet in landscape architecture. I think that all of the resumes of all of those expert witnesses have been submitted to the Commission for their consideration.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, and we had a chance to review them while we were waiting for the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 Power Point to achieve lift off. So, does anyone have 2 objections to the experts being designated in their 3 respective fields? 4 Okay, thank you. 5 MR. GLASGOW: Thank you. Before proceeding with the testimony of 6 the witnesses, I'd like to give a very brief opening 7 statement concerning this project. 8 This site is comprised of approximately 9 10 11.6 acres of ground, improved with two existing 11 buildings to be retained, parts of which were 12 constructed in the 1920s. These buildings will be developed with a total of 61 units on about 1.6 acres 13 14 of ground, and will contain 12 affordable senior 15 citizen units in one of the buildings. The other ten acres of the site will be 16 17 developed with 126 single-family units, including 18 detached single-family houses and townhouses. As a part of this project, the total 19 20 affordable housing component is 17 units for the 21 development, with five of the town homes also being 22 affordable units. This case was originally set down in 23 24 November of 2005, and the Applicant has spent 25 significant time, energy and effort in continuing to meet with the Office of Planning, D.C. agencies, and the community, to address issues and concerns, including the reduction in the number of units in the site, and the significant increase in park area and green space, including the expansion of the great lawn to almost 24,000 square feet in size, and the devotion of about 5,000 square feet of park area off Chillum Place, N.E., as shown on the site plan.

We are also pleased to have the support of the Office of Planning for this project and the D.C. agencies that we've been working with.

This development has two major distinguishing features that warrant its approval by the Commission, along with the other attributes as set forth in the documents of the Applicant and the Office of Planning.

First, the project is, in fact, low density development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, while utilizing the existing buildings. In the ten acres which are not occupied by the existing buildings, there are less than 13 units per acre.

Secondly, the development provides a unique opportunity only available through the PUD process, whereby a mix of unit types, price ranges, and the inclusion of affordable units and senior

1 citizen housing is available for this type of 2 development. If you developed it matter of right under R-1-B you wouldn't have any of that. 3 4 We believe that these are significant factors for the Commission to take into consideration 5 in its deliberation, and we hope for approval of this 6 7 significant project. If there are no preliminary questions, I'd 8 like to proceed with the testimony of the witnesses, 9 10 first calling Mr. Jarvis. 11 MR. JARVIS: Good evening to the 12 Commissioners, my name is N. William Jarvis, of The 13 Jarvis Company, and we are one of the partner owners 14 of the site and the Applicant in this process. 15 I wanted to take my time to explain to the Commission how we got to where we are at this point in 16 17 time. 18 When we first acquired the property and 19 began to look at what should be done there, we had a 20 couple of underlying principles that we used. One was to maintain the consistency of the current 21 22 neighborhood, to try and get the same type of housing 23 mix, the same type of architectural standards, the same kind of an urban grid, so that we wouldn't have 24

a development project that was out of place with the

greater neighborhood. And, in doing that type of an analysis, we actually did a survey of the neighborhood. We took about a ten-block radius around the site, and we went and we looked at the type of homes there, and we counted them. We counted how many single-family homes were there, there are triplexes, duplexes and multi-family homes, all in the surrounding areas in that area, and so we tried to make sure that what we were planning to do wasn't out of bounds or too inconsistent with the housing mix that was already there.

We were very interested in maintaining an urban development, where we would maintain the urban grid already existing in that neighborhood. And, I say the urban grid to juxtapose that to a suburban type of development, where you would see cul-de-sacs, and you would see maybe a fenced type of development and a community that wasn't connected with the remaining part of the neighborhood.

And, we also were very interested in trying to develop for the neighborhood a diverse housing mix. We were looking for a housing mix that was going to be applicable to families, to first-time home buyers, to singles, to seniors, in other words something for everyone, because, frankly, in that

neighborhood you do see a wide range of that type of individual and family mix in the neighborhood as well.

So, those were our underlying principles. In addition, we looked at the architectural issues, we looked at the way that the houses were positioned, the streets, the landscaping, the pathways, the sidewalks, the flower beds, those type of things, and we tried to come up with a development project that was going to fit within those principles.

And so, we also, though, when we started off, we added elements to this development that we thought would be appreciated by a community, and that would work. Now, we had, for example, a retail strip, where we had envisioned there would be a coffee shop, and a cleaners, and maybe an ice cream shop, something small, I mean no more than four or five, you know, type of stores that would service that community. We thought that it would be nice to have a little park at the entranceway of the District of Columbia at New Hampshire Avenue and at Rittenhouse Place.

And so, we put all those things into the development, and then we go out and meet with the community. And, of course, as these things go, we find out that not everybody in that community likes the same type of things that we liked, and so we went

through this process and we began the process in November of 2004, meeting with the Single Member District for that site.

This site is a little bit unique in that we abut New Hampshire Avenue, and we are within ANC 4B-07, but immediately across the street is ANC 4B-08. So, the people who are immediately affected are in two separate ANCs and two separate -- they have two separate neighborhood organizations, two separate ANC Commissioners, et cetera, and we tried to do our best to spend as much time as we could with everybody in that community.

When I look down my list of the number of meetings that we attended, I get approximately 20 formal meetings in the community. When I say formal meetings I mean going to a Single Member District meeting, going to a formal and organized neighborhood association meeting, like the Citizens Aware or the Lamond Community Action Group, or the Lamond-Riggs Citizens Association, going to the actual ANC meetings, and in this case going to two separate community meetings that were called by the leadership of the community, and with the sole purpose and the sole agenda item being our particular project.

So, within that, we started in November of

2004, and in the course of those meetings there were
a number of things that came out. Not everybody in
the community had the same ideas of what we were
supposed to do, so we tried our best to blend and
agree upon the things that we could agree upon and try
to manage this process the best way that we could.
But, the things that we came away with as the benefits
of the community that were specifically asked for by
the community, was that we would have all brick
construction on all the new homes, that we would, you
know, put new trees around there, and we are planning
to do new curbs along Sligo Mill Road, and parts of
New Hampshire Avenue, and Chillum Place, and Peabody
Street. We've some 200 new trees that we're planting
there, tremendously landscaped lawns, and a
significantly increased green space from where we
started, 297, I think that's the correct number, on-
site parking spaces, because almost all of the homes
have either two-car garage or two-car driveways, and
there are approximately 83 visitor parking spaces that
are going to be not connected to the home, but still
within the development, with the idea again that
people were concerned that our development might have
some impact on the surrounding neighborhoods, and we
wanted to make sure that people would still be able to

park in front of the homes in the neighborhood, as they do now

retain, one of them we agreed with the neighborhood would be a seniors-only condominium building. The larger existing building would have a ground floor all purpose community center room, open to the surrounding community. We agreed to remove the unsightly industrial components of the current buildings, which right now the current buildings could clearly be seen to have a front and a back, and in that case the back of it abuts and looks directly across the street at a number of people on Sligo Mill Road. So, we were trying to reconfigure the building's architecturally so that neither side would be able to say that they are facing the back of a building.

We took away the retail development, and we said that there would be no commercial development there. We agreed upon some affordable housing, that over the period of time there was a balance, there were some meetings in the neighborhood where people wanted to restrict the number of affordable units. There were some pressures to add some affordable units, and so we agreed to have all of the seniors building to be affordable units and five additional of

the town homes.

One of the biggest dilemmas that we had in matching the interest of the community were the people who liked the diverse housing mix that we were putting forth in the development, but yet didn't like the density. And so, we were trying to balance that.

And, many times we took houses out, and we went through the process and we took more houses out, and then we went through the process and we took more houses out.

We still have the issue of some people saying, look, we want single-family homes, but counter balanced against the people who say, well, we don't want single-family homes, because they will be more expensive and they'll drive up the tax assessment, or they won't be affordable for the people who normally live in these homes, in this neighborhood and in this community. So, we constantly were balancing that.

But, we went through a very long process with the community, which consisted, to be highlighted, of starting in November of 2004, of having community-wide meetings called by the leadership of the community, not by us, community-wide meetings in April of 2005 and July of 2005, where we came away with positive community support for the

project.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Nonetheless, we continued to work with the community, and continued to receive advice, and critique, and criticism about what it was that we were We ended up having a very small organized meeting with all of the members of the ANC, and the representatives of the two primary community groups on either side of New Hampshire Avenue in February, and closed that meeting when we heard from that there were still concerns with the density. We maintained all of the promises that we had made to the community up until that moment in time, and I'm talking about December of 2006, so we maintained every negotiated issue that we maintained, and yet we still diminished the density even further in an effort to be good neighbors and satisfy the community, and keep this project moving along.

As a result, I think that we have come up with a development project that we feel, not only has significant community input, but that we feel is an appropriate development for the District of Columbia to try to capture the people who want to live in the District of Columbia, which aren't all people who want to live in, you know, very expensive housing. And so, we were trying our best to get something that had a

1	diverse mix and diverse housing types so that we could
2	have a diverse mixture of singles, of newly-married
3	people, people with children, people without children,
4	seniors, et cetera, living in this neighborhood.
5	Thank you.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
7	MR. GLASGOW: And, I believe the Commission
8	members have a copy of that list of all the community
9	meetings that Mr. Jarvis attended.
LO	All right, thank you.
L1	I'd like to next call Mr. Geoff Ferrell
L2	and Art Lohsen, architects for the project.
L3	Mr. Ferrell, would you please proceed with
L4	your testimony.
L5	MR. FERRELL: For the record, Geoffrey
L6	Ferrell, with Ferrell Madden Associates.
L7	Is there a way we could lower the light
L8	level, since the information is all directed on the
L9	screen?
20	I'm going to be talking about the urban
21	design of the project, how we started, which was we
22	started by looking at the large area and the
23	neighborhood.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, it's not set up
25	for that. You can just feel free to move around if

1 you need to see. There's some chairs on this side 2 that you can pull around if you like. MR. FERRELL: We began by looking at the 3 4 larger area, just where it is situated. Certainly, 11 5 acres is different out in a green fill than in the Here you see the project, the yellow line 6 7 is the border with Maryland, the red line Metro Rail, and relatively close to two Metro Rail stations. 8 9 Zooming in further, this is New Hampshire, 10 the green line. The yellow line again, Eastern 11 Avenue, the state line with Maryland, and here are the 12 rails for the Metro Rail. The rail is quite close, 13 the station is a little bit of a walk away. 14 notice the industrial uses that are backed up to the 15 Metro Rail. In looking at the large area, we found, of 16 17 course, this is not a green fill site, it's in the 18 District, it's urban infill, on a major avenue, really 19 good bus service and Metro service, and close to 20 commercial activity. 21 This is looking down into the District on 22 New Hampshire, and a quick tour around the 23 neighborhood to get a kind of idea, the neighborhoods 24 rather, to get an idea of the character.

This is the other side of New Hampshire

Avenue on Quackenbos. You see brick houses, narrow tree-lined streets, traffic column streets.

Now, this is flipping back to the property on New Hampshire. These are the three houses that are facing New Hampshire on the property. The site itself is right behind these houses, and to the right and to the left.

Now, if you turn 180 degrees from this new end of the District, you'll see that the State of Maryland has had a slightly different attitude about planning, the character changes a little bit, lots of commercial, and turning to the right looking down Eastern Avenue commercial, light industrial, higher density housing. Now, let's turn back to the left and get back on our side of the line, and look at the intersection, this is Rittenhouse coming into New Hampshire. If we turn and look up the hill, there's quite a steep hill, these houses right behind them their rear property line is common with ours. proceed on up Rittenhouse Street, at the top of the hill it melds into Sligo Mill. It's hard to tell where one ends and one begins. These houses, the same set of houses with the property behind them.

Further down Sligo on the southern end of the property you see there twins, or duplexes, also

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

note the stone pillar from the hospital grounds. Turning left, Sligo ends at Chillum Street, industrial uses, backing up to the Metro. Further downhill, this is 1st Street, N.E., not quite connecting with New Hampshire as you look south. Another quality you see there, the existing L'Enfant grid, and this is the original of the two buildings that are on the site, two existing buildings, very carefully sited, it's sitting there for very solid reasons. It really links in with that L'Enfant grid. It's terminating the vista of two streets.

This is the second building, slightly younger than the first. The first building definitely is worth saving and doing something with. And, on the smaller scale in the neighborhood, we found a real mix of sizes and types of houses, interrupted, slightly damaged L'Enfant grid because of the Rail, and then these two wonderful buildings. These are things that informed our urban design from the beginning.

Our goals were to create a great place, which in an urban environment like the District means great street space, seamlessly knit into the neighborhoods to complement them, and to provide a diversity of kinds of levels of housing.

Some initial thoughts, these are very

early thoughts. First, to take advantage of these existing buildings, here's a sketch that shows how that vista would be lined with houses. It's a street marching up the hill to the big house, the big condominium. Single-family houses at some level were always part of our thought, and also taking advantage of the existing street trees, street walls, and other architectural features on the site.

And, from the very beginning a central civic green was part of our idea for this property, and also a public civic green for the neighborhood as well.

This is the Morevall site plan, after a lot of work with the neighbors, you have in front of you. These yellow pads are covering what are now single-family houses in the submitted plan.

Initially, they were not, they were something else, townhouses or small apartment buildings, but we very quickly evolved to that, facing like with like across the street, single-family houses facing single-family houses, fewer units. And, the central green has more than doubled in size from where we started.

Here you see the existing street grid and how we pulled it into and through the site, also the alley system on a smaller scale. It's a very porous

and fine grain site, very pedestrian oriented. These are very traffic columned streets, and used the streets to set up and celebrate the existing great architecture there.

This is a very -- this is a piece of the neighborhood we intend to stay here for just about forever, so it's got to be sustainable. We are reusing the existing buildings. We've got green roofs, the utilities are underground, and we are doing some creative and smart things with storm water management. We are planning extensive planting of new trees and landscaping, parks, public spaces, open spaces, and a lot of private areas, private yards, for the houses.

Here's a graphic, you see how these civic greens, these open spaces, are different types in different places, located throughout the environment. It's hard to walk for more than about one minute down these streets without coming to something new, pocket parks, a dog park in the upper left.

And also, on the larger condominium building green roofs on the two new wings.

The street trees are designed in their distribution, different kinds of trees giving identity, and certainly in the fall spectacular color

that's unique to each street, Sycamore, Green Ash, Liberty Elm, Red Maple, and on the alleys we are planting Silver Lyndons.

This is a detail of the great lawn, and if you can make out these, these are people, you can see it's quite a large scale spot, a detail of it, well designed, but there's a simple open space for people to use. The next slide we look at is going to be up on the northern edge of that, a tiered park that helps create the separation between the public great lawn and these houses which you see, their front doors and front porches facing the park, crescent pocket park, thoroughly detailed, well thought out. The park in front of the smaller condominium building, park area connecting along the streets, pocket park next to the large condominium building, and it's a dog's world, the dog park on Chillum Place where e thoroughly designed for people who own dogs in the area.

MR. LOHSEN: Thank you, Madam Chair,

Members of the Commission, my name is Art Lohsen, a

principal with Franck Lohsen McCrery Architects here
in Washington. We were responsible for developing the
architectural design of the individual units.

And, we started with that, with a very keen intent on making it contextual, being very

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

focused on developing the townhouse and single-family house types from Washingtonian prototypes. The townhouses are based on an 18-foot module, which is very common in Washington. The single-family houses are based on sort of typical small brick square house that's found throughout the surrounding neighborhood and a lot that are sort of inside the Beltway suburban Washington.

We felt it was very important to coordinate the new construction with the details and the character of the existing buildings, and to us that includes the brick construction, it includes traditional details, such as cornice and trim, it includes double-hung windows with brick jack arches and a significant amount of painted white wood trim.

In meeting with the community, when we started to get their input, one of their concerns was that the quality of the new construction be at least up to par with the existing buildings and the surrounding community. And, one of those aspects of that quality was having brick facades, and in the design process we were able to commit to having brick on all four facades of all the buildings.

Architecturally, we were also very focused on reinforcing this great urban plan. We wanted to

make good streets, and include front porches where we could, architectural detail at the front stoops, to really create that sense of community and to provide convenient places for community interaction.

We did a lot of work with the parking.

Each single-family house and townhouse contains two off-street parking spaces. Each one contains a garage, either a one-car garage or a two-car garage, and the end result is, as Mr. Jarvis had mentioned, we end up 83 additional on-street parking spaces beyond zone requirements, and those provide spaces for visitors and overflow parking for residents, so there should be, hopefully, no impact at all on the surrounding neighborhoods' parking.

The urban design and the use of the alleys allows us to separate service uses and separate public and private uses. We are able to hide the parking and garage doors behind the units. We are also able to run the utilities and make our utility connections and locate our meters behind the buildings, so that the street fronts are very nice and aesthetically pleasing.

Otherwise, we were interested in maintaining these very traditional townhouses and single-family houses on the outside, but to be able to

incorporate open modern interiors on the inside, large open rooms to be as flexible and as attractive to the market as they can. These also include 9-foot ceilings on all of the main floors, large windows to let in a lot of light, and we've also incorporated windows on the end of all the townhouse units.

The project proposes to reuse the two main existing buildings. They are to be fully renovated for use as condominiums. There will be a range of unit sizes from efficiencies to one, two, and three bedroom units in the buildings.

Beneath the large building there will be a new parking garage built, which I believe holds 31 parking spaces, there's a new community room in the large condominium building, which fronts directly onto the large civic green, again, for community use providing a real amenity to the neighborhood.

The smaller building will contain an elevator, be fully handicap accessible, and is intended to be used for primarily elderly residents.

Again, in our meetings with the community, one of the things we heard most often was a strong desire for a mix of unit types, price points, and unit sizes, and we worked very hard to try to do that.

Our single-family houses vary from three

1 to four bedrooms, some of them may actually feature an 2 optional fifth bedroom. The townhouses range from two 3 to four bedrooms, and that flexibility in the number 4 of bedrooms per unit gives us the opportunity of 5 providing housing opportunities for elderly residents, young families, single parents, both that already live 6 7 in the neighborhood as well as people moving into the 8 District. We've incorporated five affordable 9 10 townhouses, distributed them throughout the plan. 11 They are indistinguishable from the rest of the 12 townhouses, and in addition to that there are, I believe, 12 affordable units in the condominium 13 14 buildings. 15 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Excuse me, sir, can you get closer to that mic? 16 MR. LOHSEN: Oh, of course. 17 18 To illustrate the diversity of the mix of 19 unit types and sizes, you see we developed five 20 townhouse types and two single-family types. And, if 21 the color shows up halfway decently, you can show that 22 we've distributed those different types throughout the 23 So, there's quite a variety of different plan. 24 housing types all across the site. 25 To walk you through the five different

townhouse types, the first, they are all three stories, the first type contains a stair on the side. The top floor contains an option to do two or three bedrooms, and it contains a one-car garage with a private driveway, and this is the second parking space.

The second townhouse type is very similar, but it contains the central stair, which allows us to make slightly larger living and kitchen/dining areas, again, to provide larger, more open areas more amenable to different market types. Again, upstairs we have the option of second or third bedroom, and a one-car garage.

The third townhouse type maintains that central stair, but it's used in deeper lots where we can put the two parking spaces on a parking pad to the rear, which results in a large family room on the ground floor.

The fourth type is, again, three stories, but it's used in situations where we need to take up some grade between the front and the back of the house. It's a stair along the side, with a two-car internal garage below, and it's entered at the second story.

The fifth townhouse type is for special

instances where we can turn the unit 90 degrees. It contains a front porch and is entered on the side, a central stair, and a two-car garage below.

And, as I mentioned, we've incorporated windows at the end units of all the townhouses, again, to bring in as much light as we can.

The single-family house designs, two types, the first is entered on the long facade.

Again, you see we have a large living family room on one side and a large open kitchen/dining on the other, brick on all four sides, including the garage.

The second house type is substantially similar, but is rotated 90 degrees for use on lots that are slightly narrower. It contains a front porch, and again, the plan is very open.

Architecturally, we wanted to incorporate a number of distinct features into these unit types, to make them blend into the community, and really exude the level of quality that the neighborhood had been asking for. We've committed to brick on all of the facades, as I mentioned, and in considering the range of brick to be used we want to do two things. We want to coordinate with the existing building, but we also want to provide a range and a patina to the new construction. All the new construction will have

1 precast concrete trim and window sills, painted wood 2 trim and front porches, double-hung windows. 3 In the end result, we feel our single 4 family and townhouse types that are completely at home 5 in this neighborhood and very Washingtonian in their 6 character. 7 The end result is to create a community, a neighborhood, to provide this range of housing types 8 9 to people who want to live and work here in our fair 10 City of Washington. 11 That's the end of our presentation. 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 13 MR. GLASGOW: The next witness is Mr. 14 Steven Suen, who has never had anywhere near this 15 amount of time. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think we should 16 17 adjust the clock. 18 MR. SUEN: Good evening, Madam Chair and Members of the Commission. I will endeavor not to use 19 20 19 minutes, mostly because I don't think I have enough 21 voice to last that long. 22 I've looked at this project and have 23 prepared an analysis, the same which is being 24 distributed to you. As you've heard from the outset, 25 the property is now zoned R-1-B, we are seeking R-5-A zoning, and I think what is salient about the R-5-B zoning, when you look at the purposes of R-5-A it's designed to permit flexibility of design by permitting in a single district all types of urban residential development. You just saw the presentation by the architects of the various types of buildings, various types of houses, detached single-family dwellings, row dwellings, conversion of the existing buildings to condominium apartments, so we accommodate that all through the R-5-A zoning.

The project, as you've heard, is a low-density residential development with the mixed unit types able to accommodate the broad range of income levels suitable for District and neighborhood residents. We've got a total of 187 residential units, 27 single-family detached houses, 99 row houses, and 61 condominium units in the two buildings, which are actually connected by a -- right now they are one building but we will always refer to them as two, because the pictures actually make them appear as if they are two. And, the smaller of the two buildings would have 12 units reserved as housing for persons aged 55 or older. I refuse to call that senior citizen housing, but I won't tell you how old I am.

With respect to the PUD evaluation

standards of Section 2403, the Commission is required to determine that the impact of the project is favorable, capable of being mitigated, or acceptable. This is new residential development, a favored use under the Comprehensive Plan and City policies. The traffic has no impact on levels of service that build out as the report by Kimley Horn in the record indicates cost of development is proposed here as an efficient use of the land, to provide for common aggregated open space, and the proposed building bulk is less than the matter of right bulk permitted under the current zoning, less than a matter of right or PUD standard for the proposed zoning.

We've gone through a detailed analysis of the Comprehensive Plan, I'll come back to that in a little bit.

As the Commission is aware, it is required under the regulations to judge, balance and reconcile the relative value of private amenities and public benefits offered, the degree of development incentives requested, and any potential adverse effect.

With respect to benefits and amenities, the key benefits here I think you've already heard outlined. We are providing 391,000 square feet of new housing in the District, converting the two vacant

buildings which were most recently used for nonresidential use into multiple dwellings, providing the
70 affordable housing units at a substantially lower
lot occupancy than permitted as a matter of right in
both the existing and proposed zoning. We have over
183,000 square feet of green space, including 11 park
and garden areas and that great lawn, which has more
than ½ an acre worth of space in it. We have the park
necklace of green space that runs throughout the site,
focusing on the central lawn green and then going out
in directions through the site.

Of the total site, 27 percent is occupied by buildings, 24 percent by private streets and driveways, 13 percent by sidewalks and parking pads, and 36 percent is green space.

You've heard discussion of the kind of landscaping, the tree installation, and the enhancement of the overall tree canopy, the street scape improvements that are described in the application, the sustainable design elements that Geoff Ferrell referred to earlier, and then execution of the first source employment agreement and LSDBE agreement.

What's that balanced against? The incentives, we are not seeking any increase in hydro

bulk over the existing or proposed matter of right.

Density, with respect to what the flexibility under
the PUD requires, we have groups of buildings
considered as a single building, we have multiple
buildings on a single subdivided lot. We need some
side yard flexibility for 19 out of the 57 lots. We
need rear year flexibility for two out of the 57 lots,
and lot occupancy for eight out of the 57 lots. The
overall lot occupancy, as I indicated earlier, is at
27.1 percent.

In the prehearing statement filed back in March, we provided a detailed lot-by-lot analysis of each of those factors, and it's fairly extensive in terms of the 57 lots. We went through each and every one, laying out the compliance with all those factors. It would take longer than the 14 minutes I have left to go through each one of those, so I'm not going to.

With respect to the Comprehensive Plan, the generalized land use map shows this to be low density residential, and we think the density range fits within that.

The housing element has as an essential theme stimulating a wider range of housing choices and strategies and the preservation of sound over stock, production of new units, encouraging housing on

suitably located public or private properties that are vacant, surplus, under utilized or unused, encouraging the private sector to meet housing needs through the development of infill housing, using planned unit developments to encourage the construction or rehabilitation of additional single and multi-family housing, suitable locations, and promoting the conservation, enhancement and revitalization of the residential neighborhoods in the District, for housing and neighborhood-related uses.

We looked at the Ward 4 element, and identified the particular provisions of the Ward 4 plan in the current Comprehensive Plan that applied to this site, and they are set forth on pages 14 and 15. I won't go through them at this point.

With respect to compatibility with the area, the surrounding area is compatible in terms of its land use designation and the actual existing development. You saw pictures that Geoff presented earlier in our presentation.

With respect to use, we have residential uses, replacing the non-residential uses in the existing building. All the new buildings to be built will be single family, detached and row house, and the site plan is designed so that the detached single-

family dwellings will abut or face detached singlefamily dwellings on adjacent and confronting
properties.

The new houses are at a maximum of
approximately 30 feet in height, less than was

approximately 30 feet in height, less than was permitted under the existing zoning, and less than what's permitted in the zoning of the surrounding area, but not out of scale with the existing neighborhood character.

And, as you've seen through our presentation already, the site layout ensures compatibility with surrounding uses and enhances the open feel of the development.

I conclude that the project is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. It is within the applicable height and bulk standards of the regulations, consistent with the surrounding residential zoning, provides an appropriate balance between the development proposed and the flexibility requested, the benefits and amenities provided, allows the Commission to condition approval without allowing more density or uncontrolled development, and I believe you should approve the application.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Suen.

MR. GLASGOW: You just made it.

1	All right, that concludes the Applicant's
2	direct. I wanted to make sure I heard correctly that
3	all of the experts that we had proffered at the
4	beginning of the hearing, they were accepted as expert
5	witnesses in their various fields.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
7	MR. GLASGOW: Thank you.
8	And then, we also have Mr. Jeter, Mr.
9	Pafazian and Mr. Mingonet here for questions, should
10	the Commission have any, in their areas of expertise.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
12	I just want to clarify something, because
13	it wasn't mentioned directly. Are you prepared to
14	accept the conditions that DDOT required in their
15	report, including the installation of a traffic
16	signal?
17	MR. GLASGOW: Yes.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
19	MR. GLASGOW: Yes, we agree with that.
20	There is one thing to mention with respect to the
21	Office of Planning report, and I have discussed this
22	briefly with the representatives of the Office of
23	Planning.
24	I believe that with respect to the
25	condition, talking about submitting a legally binding

1 homeowners' agreement regarding maintenance of the private streets, I think there was a concern on behalf 2 3 of DDOT that after the project, assuming the 4 Commission were to approve it, that the homeowners' association then would try to transfer the maintenance 5 of the private streets over to DDOT. 6 7 I think that the best way to deal with 8 that issue is in the PUD covenant, that if the 9 Commission does approve that there would be a 10 condition that the homeowners' association would be 11 responsible for that, and that they would not be 12 transferred over at a later date, rather than get into 13 this something about drafting a homeowners' 14 association document now. 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. MR. GLASGOW: Having negotiation on that. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. All right, 18 thanks. 19 Ouestions from the Commission. 2.0 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, before we move on with that, are we going to have a 21 22 presentation from the transportation consultant? 23 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: If they are available. 24 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Are you just going 25 to give us one, I mean, a three-minute presentation?

1 MR. GLASGOW: If the Commission desires, we 2 have worked extensively with DDOT on this project. 3 Their report is in support of the application, and we 4 have no problem with their conditions. We wanted to make sure we fit within the 5 50 minutes. Of course, we ended up with about 12 6 7 minutes to go. If you'd like to --8 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: You've still got 12 9 minutes. I mean, I think it would be good to at least 10 have a three to five minute presentation from the 11 traffic consultant. MR. GLASGOW: I'd like to call Mr. Pafazian 12 13 on that. Could you please summarize your report, and 14 give your conclusions, and discuss any of the issues 15 that you worked with with DDOT on the project? MR. PAFAZIAN: Good evening. My name is 16 17 Edward Pafazian with the firm of Kimberly Horn and 18 Associates. We prepared the traffic analysis for the 19 Applicant. 20 We initially met with DDOT staff to 21 understand and to agree on an appropriate study area. 22 We analyzed the surrounding intersections that 23 surround the property. We began the analysis, we did 24 the typical steps in the traffic analysis, starting

with existing a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic counts.

We forecasted future conditions. We then took into consideration trip generation of the proposed application, the number of residential units, and, in fact, as indicated previously, our analysis was based on a previous proposal for 199 residential units, and the number has been cut back to 187. So, our analysis a little bit was based on an earlier plan.

At any rate, on this basis we analyzed the traffic conditions under existing condition, and we also added the trip generation for the proposed units, added those trips to the intersection counts that we performed to develop and forecast future traffic conditions.

Several elements about this plan need to be brought out. They are demonstrated on the screen. While we have 187 residential units, there are numerous access drives, vehicle access points, which provide the opportunity for effective disbursal of those trips, so no one location, no one intersection, is going to be burdened with heavy traffic.

The plan is well laid out, just like in an urban setting, with, essentially, multiple streets that go through the property that enable the residents, the drivers, to exit at the more convenient, the most convenient driveway that serves

their unit, and that gets them to where they want to go and come from.

So, one of the great benefits of this project is the multiple access drives that result in significant disbursal of traffic and no burdening of any one location.

As indicated earlier, the area intersections will operate at good levels of service with the proposed development in place. Those findings are reinforced by the DDOT staff report, they agree with our conclusions, and it's also reflected in the Office of Planning report.

Our design of our project is consistent with the idea of traffic calming. We have, while we provide multiple opportunities for vehicles, for drivers that travel through the property, the streets are designed in such a way as to avoid the situation of any speeding. The streets have on-street parking on them, plus there are 20-foot wide travel ways for two-way traffic. This is very consistent with good urban planning to discourage cut-through traffic, to discourage high rates of speed, but to provide an effective opportunity for the residents to travel through the property.

While the streets are well designed in an

urban setting, we also have in our plan a demonstration that the service vehicles can negotiate and that the fire trucks can negotiate the streets to provide emergency access and service access throughout the property. There's a good system besides the streets of alleyway, consistent with the urban setting that we are in, to provide that kind of emergency and service for the residents.

As earlier indicated, there will be ample parking to be provided on the property, more than ample parking, so that there is not going to be any effect of spillover parking into the surrounding communities, so there will no adverse effect resulting from the parking.

In discussions with the DDOT, we are going to upgrade pedestrian connections in the area, the internal -- the property has a system of sidewalks and pedestrian pathways that enable the residents to be able to go to the sidewalks along New Hampshire Avenue, so there will be good pedestrian access within the property to get residents to the surrounding -- to New Hampshire Avenue and the surrounding streets.

There will be upgrades consistent with conditions indicated by DDOT. There will be upgrading of pedestrian crosswalks at intersections where some

improvement is required, and in order to promote access and promote safety for drivers entering and exiting, the Applicant has agreed to install a traffic signal at the intersection of New Hampshire Avenue and Quackenbos, which would be opposite one of our entrances. This is a condition that was suggested, that was laid out by the District DDOT, and we agreed to that, and that will provide a safer entry and exit for folks that are entering and exiting from the driveway opposite Quackenbos. In summary, our project, our development, from a traffic standpoint, will have no adverse effect, negligible effect. The traffic will be -- the traffic generation will be disbursed effectively into the surrounding streets. We are promoting pedestrian safety and pedestrian access, and also providing a safer condition by providing a traffic signal at the Quackenbos and New Hampshire Avenue intersection. And, I would be very happy to answer any questions you may have. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Okay, questions from the Commission for Mr. Pafazian or others. Mr. Hood? VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll start off.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Let me ask this first, maybe this is for Mr. Jarvis. I don't know where I saw it, but in your public benefits and amenities, I saw some mention of, I guess, making a donation to the rec center, was that something you offered to the community? I think it was -- there were a number of things I saw dollar amounts, but then when I looked in the Office of Planning report I didn't see it. Has something changed?

MR. JARVIS: Commissioner, no. We had, in the course of our conversations with the community, made offers towards that type of a community benefits package, in addition to the community amenities of the development, and that's something that we made an offer, I think initially back in December of 2005.

We haven't gotten an acceptance, a revision, or anything from the people in the community, so what we did was, we made the offer and it was there. We just haven't gotten a community response that that's, yes, what we want, that that's, no, what we what, that it should be changed. So, we just tried to put the best offer on the table that we could to do that type of community benefits in addition to the other things that we were doing.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, that's still

1 out there, those offers are still outstanding. 2 MR. JARVIS: Yes. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Just to clarify, there 3 4 was -- it was attached to someone's testimony, or 5 their submission, that there was a proposed agreement that delineated all of these. Is that the benefits 6 7 package that's currently on the table, because it wasn't enumerated in your submission. So, I think 8 that's what Mr. Hood is trying to find out, is what --9 10 how have you quantified that? 11 MR. JARVIS: Well, I don't know what you 12 We have a written offer that we have may have seen. 13 made, and to my knowledge it hasn't been agreed to by 14 anybody in the community. It doesn't change what it 15 is, I just don't want to say that it's exactly what it 16 is that you have in your hand. 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Are you proffering 18 that as part of this PUD? 19 MR. GLASGOW: Yes, we're proffering it as 2.0 part of the PUD, but to make sure, do you have a copy? 21 I think what we want to make sure then is that we'll 22 submit the copy this evening in case, for whatever 23 reason, we are not looking at the same thing that you 24 are looking at. 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. We want to

1	know everything that's being proffered, and Mr. Suen
2	went through and delineated everything, but that
3	wasn't on his list. So, we want to make sure that we
4	have everything.
5	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And, Mr. Jarvis,
6	maybe you can help me with this. How long has the
7	senior home been in operation on that site? I know
8	there was an office use at some point in time, how
9	long how the senior home been there?
10	MR. JARVIS: Well, the building itself
11	I'm not sure that as a nursing home it was still used
12	up until that point, there was an organization, a
13	nurses organization that was using it up to 2004, but
14	it wasn't being used as a seniors facility.
15	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, it's been
16	vacant for a while?
17	MR. JARVIS: Yes, yes, it has.
18	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And again, I always
19	say this at every hearing, my orientation you
20	wouldn't believe I have an orientation merit badge,
21	but anyway, New Hampshire Avenue runs north and south,
22	right?
23	MR. WAYS: Yes.
24	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: On, I think it's
25	Peabody Street, there is on Peabody Street there is

Maybe that goes to the architect. I'll just ask somebody from the neighborhood, I'm just curious, is that taking Tynes' place or what is it? MR. JARVIS: There are a couple of lumber yards before you get to Kansas Avenue, and then across the other side on Kansas Avenue would be the facility that Mr. Tynes owns, Eagle Maintenance. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm sorry, it's going west I guess it's west of Peabody, Chillum Place, Chillum Place, what use, is that Dickie Tynes' place? MR. JARVIS: He's at Kansas and VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use is going on there? That's what I'm trying to because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Community room. Is	1	a zoning CM-1, what uses are taking place there?
that taking Tynes' place or what is it? MR. JARVIS: There are a couple of lumber yards before you get to Kansas Avenue, and then across the other side on Kansas Avenue would be the facility that Mr. Tynes owns, Eagle Maintenance. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm sorry, it's going west I guess it's west of Peabody, Chillum Place, Chillum Place, what use, is that Dickie Tynes' place? MR. JARVIS: He's at Kansas and VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use is going on there? That's what I'm trying to because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	2	Maybe that goes to the architect. I'll just ask
MR. JARVIS: There are a couple of lumber yards before you get to Kansas Avenue, and then across the other side on Kansas Avenue would be the facility that Mr. Tynes owns, Eagle Maintenance. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm sorry, it's going west I guess it's west of Peabody, Chillum Place, Chillum Place, what use, is that Dickie Tynes' place? MR. JARVIS: He's at Kansas and VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use is going on there? That's what I'm trying to because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	3	somebody from the neighborhood, I'm just curious, is
yards before you get to Kansas Avenue, and then across the other side on Kansas Avenue would be the facility that Mr. Tynes owns, Eagle Maintenance. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm sorry, it's going west I guess it's west of Peabody, Chillum Place, Chillum Place, what use, is that Dickie Tynes' place? MR. JARVIS: He's at Kansas and VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use is going on there? That's what I'm trying to because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	4	that taking Tynes' place or what is it?
the other side on Kansas Avenue would be the facility that Mr. Tynes owns, Eagle Maintenance. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm sorry, it's going west I guess it's west of Peabody, Chillum Place, Chillum Place, what use, is that Dickie Tynes' place? MR. JARVIS: He's at Kansas and VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use is going on there? That's what I'm trying to because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	5	MR. JARVIS: There are a couple of lumber
that Mr. Tynes owns, Eagle Maintenance. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm sorry, it's going west I guess it's west of Peabody, Chillum Place, Chillum Place, what use, is that Dickie Tynes' place? MR. JARVIS: He's at Kansas and VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use is going on there? That's what I'm trying to because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	6	yards before you get to Kansas Avenue, and then across
9 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm sorry, it's 10 going west I guess it's west of Peabody, Chillum 11 Place, Chillum Place, what use, is that Dickie Tynes' 12 place? 13 MR. JARVIS: He's at Kansas and 14 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use 15 is going on there? That's what I'm trying to 16 because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what 17 use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the 18 neighborhood. 19 MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. 20 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a 21 lumber yard right there. Okay. 22 And, there was mention of a community 23 center, I think it was a community center. 24 MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	7	the other side on Kansas Avenue would be the facility
going west I guess it's west of Peabody, Chillum Place, Chillum Place, what use, is that Dickie Tynes' place? MR. JARVIS: He's at Kansas and VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use is going on there? That's what I'm trying to because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	8	that Mr. Tynes owns, Eagle Maintenance.
Place, Chillum Place, what use, is that Dickie Tynes' place? MR. JARVIS: He's at Kansas and VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use is going on there? That's what I'm trying to because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	9	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'm sorry, it's
place? MR. JARVIS: He's at Kansas and VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use is going on there? That's what I'm trying to because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	10	going west I guess it's west of Peabody, Chillum
MR. JARVIS: He's at Kansas and VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use is going on there? That's what I'm trying to because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	11	Place, Chillum Place, what use, is that Dickie Tynes'
VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use is going on there? That's what I'm trying to because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	12	place?
is going on there? That's what I'm trying to because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	13	MR. JARVIS: He's at Kansas and
because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	14	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, so what use
use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	15	is going on there? That's what I'm trying to
neighborhood. MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	16	because it's zoned CM-1, and I'm curious as to what
MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	17	use it is. If we don't know now, I'll just ask the
20 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a 21 lumber yard right there. Okay. 22 And, there was mention of a community 23 center, I think it was a community center. 24 MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	18	neighborhood.
lumber yard right there. Okay. And, there was mention of a community center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	19	MR. JARVIS: The lumber yards.
22 And, there was mention of a community 23 center, I think it was a community center. 24 MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	20	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, there's a
center, I think it was a community center. MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	21	lumber yard right there. Okay.
MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.	22	And, there was mention of a community
	23	center, I think it was a community center.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Community room. Is	24	MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.
	25	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Community room. Is

1 the neighborhood or the ANC, are they in agreement 2 that the community groups would be able to use that, 3 or is that just for the residents on site? 4 MR. JARVIS: No, this is going to be for 5 the use and the availability of everyone in the neighborhood. 6 7 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: In the 8 neighborhood. 9 MR. JARVIS: Yes. 10 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And, it's on site? 11 MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir. 12 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: How is that going to be managed? 13 14 MR. JARVIS: We'll have to do something in 15 the condominium documents to deal with that situation, to make sure that it is preserved in that fashion, and 16 that there is a management scheme that allows that 17 18 into the future. But, we have made some other 19 commitments with respect to the community, I mean the 20 condominium documents, for instance, investment, I 21 mean, owner occupied only, and not investment 22 property, so that they couldn't be rented. So, we had 23 always envisioned that there would be some condominium documentation for those buildings that would have some 24 25 issues delineated in it.

1	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: So, if I purchased
2	a home, and I move in, and I have a problem with the
3	whole neighborhood being able to come on site and use
4	that community room, all that's going to be worked
5	out?
6	MR. GLASGOW: You will buy your unit,
7	Commissioner Hood, knowing that the community can use
8	that community room.
9	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I'll know it up
10	front.
11	MR. GLASGOW: You will know it up front.
12	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
13	MR. GLASGOW: And, if the Commission
14	approves the application, we would expect that to be
15	a condition in the order, so that when you get your
16	title report, you know, you have the covenant that
17	goes with the PUD, and it's right in there, and it
18	will be in the and with respect to a condominium
19	association and the homeowners' association, with the
20	disclosure you would also disclose all of those type
21	uses so you don't have somebody come back at you later
22	on that, you know, as the declarant. Mr. Jarvis and
23	the developers will be the declarant.
24	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you.
25	Mr. Ferrell

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Can I just, I just
2	want to clarify a point or two, as to the use of the
3	community room. I mean, I think we need some kind of
4	language that will be incorporated into any proposed
5	order that delineates, this is not just free access to
6	the community. So, what is that going to look like,
7	specifically?
8	MR. GLASGOW: Right, right, yes, there
9	would be, obviously, rules and conditions.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right, but I think we
11	need a little bit more detail about how that would be
12	articulated in the condominium documents.
13	MR. GLASGOW: Sure, we would be we would
14	submit that for the record.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. And then, I
16	thought I understood you to say that another thing
17	that you proffered is that these units, all of these
18	units will be for owner occupancy only, and no rental
19	would be permitted. Is that did I hear that
20	correctly?
21	MR. JARVIS: That's correct.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Mr. Hood,
23	please go ahead.
24	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Well, thank you.
25	I'm looking at the slope of the land at

2 east? 3 MR. FERRELL: We can ask the engineer to give you the exact on that, it's a 50-foot drop from the high point down to the intersection of Rittenhous and New Hampshire, 5 percent, I think we as a general rule we didn't go above 5 percent. 8 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's fine, 9 because my concern, and these don't have basements 10 MR. JARVIS: That is correct, they do no VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, that's a go	om se
give you the exact on that, it's a 50-foot drop fr the high point down to the intersection of Rittenhou and New Hampshire, 5 percent, I think we as a general rule we didn't go above 5 percent. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's fine, because my concern, and these don't have basements MR. JARVIS: That is correct, they do no	om se
the high point down to the intersection of Rittenhou and New Hampshire, 5 percent, I think we as a general rule we didn't go above 5 percent. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's fine, because my concern, and these don't have basements MR. JARVIS: That is correct, they do no	se
and New Hampshire, 5 percent, I think we as a general rule we didn't go above 5 percent. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's fine, because my concern, and these don't have basements MR. JARVIS: That is correct, they do no	t.
general rule we didn't go above 5 percent. VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's fine, because my concern, and these don't have basements MR. JARVIS: That is correct, they do no	t.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: That's fine, because my concern, and these don't have basements MR. JARVIS: That is correct, they do no	t.
because my concern, and these don't have basements MR. JARVIS: That is correct, they do no	t.
MR. JARVIS: That is correct, they do no	t.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, that's a go	od
point, because cluster one and two would have a	
problem, I think, with drainage and water runoff. B	ut
anyway, that's not an issue.	
Traffic, and I asked for you to come u	p,
and I didn't get your name, I'm sorry.	
MR. PAFAZIAN: Ed Pafazian.	
VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. Pafazian, oka	у.
19 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I need you to turn	
your mic on when you respond to Mr. Hood.	
MR. PAFAZIAN: Ed Pafazian.	
22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.	
VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Did you	
24 actually go out and watch the trips and everything	
when you were doing your analysis?	

1	MR. PAFAZIAN: Yes.
2	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: On New Hampshire
3	Avenue?
4	MR. PAFAZIAN: Yes.
5	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: And, I don't
6	frequent New Hampshire Avenue anymore, but I used to
7	notice, it used to back up from well, it used to
8	maybe because of the time signals and other things,
9	but it has changed, so I can't compare
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, we can't have
11	all of you calling out, it's whoever is responding.
12	So, I appreciate the enthusiasm in trying to help us,
13	but if you feel that you need to clarify something you
14	can do it in your testimony. Thank you.
15	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: When traffic is
16	going in the p.m. hours, traffic is going out toward
17	Ward 9 and 10, when traffic is going out in the p.m.
18	hours, and we are looking at a traffic light at
19	Quackenbos
20	MR. PAFAZIAN: Yes.
21	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I guess I'm
22	pronouncing it right, will that traffic back up from,
23	what is that, Rittenhouse, well at Rittenhouse there's
24	a traffic light.
25	MR. PAFAZIAN: Yes.

1 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Back to Ouackenbos. 2 And, the reason I'm asking, because I used to know that a back up used to exist for a while, and you 3 4 could see it, and maybe things have changed, I don't Has that been looked at? 5 know. MR. PAFAZIAN: Well, this, once again, the 6 7 installation of this traffic signal at Quackenbos, is a condition of actually the traffic engineering 8 9 portion of DDOT, and any design of that traffic signal 10 would be done in such a way that the timing was such 11 that there would not be -- that it would operate 12 effectively without backing up into the adjacent 13 intersection. So, this is something that as the 14 signal gets designed in our collaboration with DDOT, 15 we would work out that progression, what we call 16 progression, to assure that that situation would not 17 occur. 18 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Typically, though, 19 on New Hampshire Avenue, the level of service is B. MR. PAFAZIAN: That's the indication from 20 21 our counts, yes, because, you know, while you -- yes, 22 that is correct, it is basically a B level of service 23 along at the intersections. 24 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. Thank you for 25 answering my question, and when I'm sitting in traffic

1	I'll remember you.
2	MR. PAFAZIAN: Okay.
3	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, thank you,
4	Madam Chair.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood.
6	Anyone else?
7	Mr. Turnbull.
8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Madam
9	Chair.
10	I've got a question on the design, some of
11	the issues with the planning and the design. I think
12	we all appreciate the idea of the homes and everything
13	being all brick, I think that's a very positive
14	additive. It's a very nice feature for the
15	neighborhood.
16	And, I guess my question gets into some of
17	the town homes, and I was just looking at the proposed
18	unit layout on sheet SO-2, and I guess, you know, when
19	we talked about lot occupancy, and how these things
20	sit, and how much land is left, you know, I mean, the
21	way you are measuring the residences, the single-
22	family detached homes are one thing, but when you get
23	into the town homes you include it gets into the
24	middle of the streets, and you are including part of
25	the lot occupancy.

1 But, when I look at some of the type, the 2 3B and the Type 4 units, you really don't have much 3 land left. Those are really smack dab from alley to 4 street. MR. LOHSEN: That's correct, most of them 6 are. 7 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I mean, some of 8 them look like there was land available and I've got 9 to get a unit in there. I mean, I don't want to sound 10 -- I think what you are trying -- what you are trying 11 to do is very well, but I think some of them just seem 12 really shoe horned in there to get units in there, and 13 it just seems kind of tight. 14 Now, I'm looking at on Hampshire Place, 15 there's the Type 4 units, it looks like there's very little land there at all, and then on Quackenbos the 16 P1 through P3, the Q1 through Q3, again, are just --17 18 that O3, I don't know how he gets in his garage, but 19 maybe there's -- it's got to be tight. I know you are 20 going to have a two-car garage, it looks tight on some 21 of them. And then, you go up to Chillum Place, and 22

And then, you go up to Chillum Place, and Peabody, you've got two of the Type 4, which stand alone, which could have been just park or green, but we put two separate units in there, they look a little

23

24

out of place. They look like you had to get something in to fit in that. I mean, I'm being kind of pessimistic and narrow minded, but when I look at the lot, looking at the way some of this is planned, it just looks -- some of it looks forced a bit in certain areas.

MR. FERRELL: Briefly, and I certainly

MR. FERRELL: Briefly, and I certainly won't try and answer all your concerns, but a central idea to District of Columbia streets and blocks, and our approach to this, is streets are fronted with the fronts of buildings. The fronts of buildings help keep eyes on the street, keep the streets safe, keep the streets occupied, and form that street space that was central to our theme.

So, some of those buildings, it's not about cramming in, it's about providing a street front along those streets.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That doesn't really answer my question. We all understand about streets, buildings facing streets, homes facing streets, I think we all understand that from a planning standpoint.

All I'm saying is that, if you've got a piece of land and the way you've configured that land to make a street, if you are left with very little

land in front and back, you simply shoehorn a piece of property to make -- to put a building in there to have a street. It just seems, some of it feels very tight. I'm just offering that as a comment, I don't know what my colleagues feel or not, but I just think some of those, as an amenity, as a place to live, you are going to have a deck sticking out on most of these, you are going to be sticking out over the alley, and which they are going to be even tighter down there. I just feel that some of those areas it's a little tight, it just seems like there are some units there that from the standpoint of a place for a green space there's nothing really there for the residents themselves to have. MR. LOHSEN: And, part of that is intentional. Again, going back to creating a number of different types of units, those units without green space, without the backyard, provide an opportunity for someone who doesn't want to take care of a backyard. The other units, the Type 1 and 2s, do have green space adjacent to the driveway. There's a little bit of yard. Some of the Type 3s, I believe, have full width, 18-foot yards at the rear.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

a certain number of units it, it was intended to provide a variety amongst the units it did have. MR. FERRELL: And, there's a balance of the public spaces we are providing, from a number of those units right across the street there's a community park. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, that's my comments for now. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull. Anybody else? Mr. Jeffries. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, see, I have a	1	So, the design wasn't intended to shoehorn
MR. FERRELL: And, there's a balance of the public spaces we are providing, from a number of those units right across the street there's a community park. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, that's my comments for now. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull. Anybody else? Mr. Jeffries. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	2	a certain number of units it, it was intended to
public spaces we are providing, from a number of those units right across the street there's a community park. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, that's my comments for now. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull. Anybody else? Mr. Jeffries. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	3	provide a variety amongst the units it did have.
units right across the street there's a community park. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, that's my comments for now. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull. Anybody else? Mr. Jeffries. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	4	MR. FERRELL: And, there's a balance of the
park. COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, that's my comments for now. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull. Anybody else? Mr. Jeffries. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	5	public spaces we are providing, from a number of those
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, that's my comments for now. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull. Anybody else? Mr. Jeffries. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	6	units right across the street there's a community
Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull. Anybody else? Mr. Jeffries. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	7	park.
Thank you. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull. Anybody else? Mr. Jeffries. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	8	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Well, that's my
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull. Anybody else? Mr. Jeffries. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	9	comments for now.
Turnbull. Anybody else? Mr. Jeffries. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	10	Thank you.
Anybody else? Mr. Jeffries. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr.
Mr. Jeffries. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	12	Turnbull.
COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	13	Anybody else?
16 I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's 17 comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering 18 the green areas and the great lawn as that will 19 have public access as well. 20 MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. 21 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners 22 and the condo owners will be responsible for 23 maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. 24 MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	14	Mr. Jeffries.
comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	15	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. I'm going to
the green areas and the great lawn as that will have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	16	I'd like to sort of follow up Vice-Chair Hood's
have public access as well. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	17	comment. I just want to be clear. Are you proffering
20 MR. GLASGOW: That is correct. 21 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners 22 and the condo owners will be responsible for 23 maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. 24 MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	18	the green areas and the great lawn as that will
21 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners 22 and the condo owners will be responsible for 23 maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. 24 MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	19	have public access as well.
and the condo owners will be responsible for maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	20	MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.
maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything. MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	21	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, the homeowners
MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.	22	and the condo owners will be responsible for
	23	maintaining that, and upkeep, and everything.
COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, see, I have a	24	MR. GLASGOW: That is correct.
• •	25	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, see, I have a

1 real concern about that, just the long-term viability 2 of that happening. 3 MR. GLASGOW: Well, it happens, for 4 instance, Commissioner Jeffries --COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Can I finish? I'd like to finish. 6 7 I'm just, and I would love to hear what you have to say about it, and this is a concern that 8 I think we continue to have here, at least I have as 9 10 relates to some of the direction from the Office of 11 Planning, is these areas that are being proffered, 12 these green areas, and, you know, if I buy a house, 13 you know, and this area is right in front of my house, 14 I'm going to take some level of ownership, and I'm 15 going to have some difficulty having to manage this, as relates to some of the neighborhood. 16 So, I understand that you are really 17 18 trying to integrate this into the overall context, but 19 I'm just -- excuse me, I'm not certain that people 2.0 really live like that. 21 So, if you could just comment on, really, 22 just, you know, the maintenance and how these green 23 areas and these pocket parks are going to work going forward. 24 25 MR. GLASGOW: There are any number of

1 communities that we are aware of, one, you don't have 2 many 11-1/2 acre sites in the District of Columbia. 3 But, in a lot of the areas in the Metropolitan Area, 4 this is quite the standard method of proceeding, and 5 these areas, in many instances, are very open to the 6 public. 7 For instance, in the Avenel project in 8 Montgomery County, the soccer fields, and all of those 9 things, are open to anybody who wants to come in from 10 the area, and the maintenance, and upkeep, and all of 11 that is by that homeowners' association there. 12 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: See, a soccer 13 field, that's interesting you would say that, because 14 just, I don't know, looking at the site plan it 15 doesn't look like a soccer field. MR. GLASGOW: Oh, it's not. 16 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: It looks like, you 17 18 know, something that belongs to what I consider to be 19 somewhat of a campus plan. MR. GLASGOW: Well, it's a green park that 20 21 is, I think the open space in it is about 25,000 22 square feet, and then the garden area to the north is, 23 what, another 5,000 to 7,000 square feet. So, we are talking about a total area here of this green that is 24

probably around 32,000, 33,000 square feet.

25

So, it's

a big size area.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's fine, I just

-- you know, I wanted to put that on the record, that

I just do have concerns about sort of this attempt to
integrate this project and having people who are not
part of this campus moving in and out, how that gets
managed, and I hope that, you know, in terms of
proffering, that you will provide a lot of specificity
as to, you know, how this is going to be managed going
forward.

My other question is, and it really ties back to this whole notion of, this still has a feel like a compound or a campus to me. It seems to look inward, and not really work with the grid. And, I thought it was really interesting, Mr. Ferrell, if you put that slide up that showed the yellow lines, and I thought it was pretty fascinating that, you know, the L'Enfant grid gets interrupted, and I can appreciate that, but I'm still -- it still doesn't seem to be in keeping with the grid of the District, even just outside.

I mean, I see some of the things you are doing in terms of Quackenbos and the other one, but, I mean, I think it's a very difficult site, but I'm just concerned that if you step outside of the

District grid then you are creating a campus. And, it's looking sort of inward to me, in terms of the overall design.

MR. FERRELL: I would love to suggest, I can talk to you out of that, a little bit of time, but I point out some things. It's a difficult site in terms of topography.

If you were to look at this site and think about, as we did initially, of simply completing the grid, you would take Quackenbos and then N.E. 1st Street, you'd blow through, really, the best of the old buildings, which are set there terminating the vista in a -- almost as a public building, in the same way that L'Enfant's plan puts the U.S. Capitol there.

I would suggest that if you were to walk down any of these sidewalks you will, indeed, notice that the trees, most of the trees, and the houses on the eastern -- sorry, the western side of New Hampshire, are newer than the ones on the eastern side, but in terms of the block structure you can walk up New Hampshire and you can take a left as easily as you can take a right, and walk through this.

We've pulled the grid in every place there was a grid to pull in, and in some places it got a little more complex because it had to, to go around

those existing buildings.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I recognize that it's a very irregular shape and so forth, but, unfortunately, I'm just -- I guess I agree somewhat with Commissioner Turnbull in terms of this shoehorning effect, I mean, it just seems that a lot is going into this site, and it's almost looking almost over-accessories, quite frankly. It's a lot of thinks happening.

And, that takes me to my third question, and that is, or just really a request, and, perhaps, it was in here, I just didn't see it, but is there a massing diagram, because, I mean, the perspectives that I'm seeing are out of the great lawn, and that could be a little deceptive as it relates to how this all sits. Is there a massing diagram of the overall compound, campus, including some of the contextual existing buildings?

MR. LOHSEN: That drawing was never prepared for the whole project. There are some street sections, and site sections, that are included as part of the PUD documentation.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. You know, Madam Chair, I mean, I'd like, you know, that we get something like that. I'd really like to see the

massing of this, including the great lawn, and you
don't have to give a lot of detail to the buildings,
I'm not interested, I'm just really trying to deal
with massing. And then, I'd like to see some of the
massing of some of the existing residential. I just
want to see this in context, because I don't think
I've really from where it's looking now, it's
looking like sort of an island, and, you know, I have
some concerns.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think that would be
especially helpful to see it with the topography and
how it all works together.
Do you understand what we are looking for?
MR. LOHSEN: Yes.
MR. FERRELL: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's it for me.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, thank you,
Commissioner Jeffries.
Commissioner Jeffries. Commissioner Parsons.
Commissioner Parsons.
Commissioner Parsons. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I wonder if you
Commissioner Parsons. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I wonder if you could, gentlemen, comment on why this shouldn't be

MR. JARVIS: Mr. Commissioner, I may not
have phrased it that way, but I would say that what we
were looking at, if we solely built it as a matter of
right, it was going to be only one probably only
one type of home. And, if it is one type of home, we
were concerned, from an economic or a marketing
factor, you know, the people who buy that type of home
may have even more asking for this to be
compartmentalized and had it be an island, maybe
they'd want a fence around it, maybe they'd want it to
be, you know, so separate from the neighborhood, just
because of, you know, what they were coming in and
expending.
We were trying not to have to do that to
start off with. So, it seemed to us that to go in
that direction had a much great likelihood of it
becoming more of a suburban type of development than
an urban type of development that fit within the
community.
COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So, you think a
gated community results if you did that?
MR. JARVIS: I'm not here to say that, I'm
just saying that I couldn't tell you that it wouldn't
be that either.
MR. GLASGOW: And also. Mr. Parsons. with

respect to the two existing buildings, under R-1-B, either you would have to have to have some other type of zone or use permitted, because they are clearly way too large for any single-family residence. So, it would have to have some type of way of dealing with the existing buildings. And so, you would not have R-1-B zoning where they are.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh, certainly.

I'm a little confused here, on Mr. Suen's report on page four, he points out that R-1-B results in an FAR of .4. Then there's a new term that I've never seen before on page three of your report. It says the project will have an overall FAR of .78, which is less than the effective matter of right density of 1.2 for the current R-1-B zoning, an effective matter of right density.

So, let Mr. Suen explain that.

MR. SUEN: In a normal R-1-B district matter of right development, FAR is not prescribed. What is prescribed is minimum lot size, the maximum lot occupancy, and maximum number of storage.

If you build a building that covered the maximum lot occupancy of 40 percent or .4 of the site, and you constructed that building to two stories, you would get an effective FAR of .8. So, a 5,000 square

1 foot lot with a 40 percent lot occupancy would allow 2 you to occupy 2,000 -- the footprint of the building 3 would be 2,000 square feet. 4 If you doubled that with two stories, you'd have 4,000 square feet, that would be 4,000 on 5 a 5,000 square foot lot, that would be .8 FAR 6 7 effectively. If you built a three-story building, which 8 is what the regulations allow as a matter of right, 9 10 you would have 1.2 FAR effectively. If you had a 11 5,000 square foot lot, with 2,000 square foot 12 footprint, build three stories you'd have 6,000 square 13 feet on a 5,000 square foot lot, that would give you 14 1.2 FAR equivalent. It's not FAR because R-1-B 15 doesn't set out FAR as a matter of right. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: That's curious, 16 17 because our regulations say that under a PUD you can't 18 get more than .4, isn't that correct? 19 MR. SUEN: That's correct. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: It looks like we 20 21 need to fix this. 22 MR. SUEN: Well, I think that's true, in 23 fact, we did some looking at this because somehow we 24 suspected that question would get asked. 25 In the almost 40 years of regulations and

1	of PUD approvals that I looked at, I couldn't find one
2	PUD approved under R-1-A or R-1-B I'm sorry, I
3	found one PUD approved under R-1-A or R-1-B since
4	1969. That was the campus of the old Marjorie Webster
5	Junior College, which Galludet bought for it's
6	northwest campus. When they bought it it was unzoned,
7	so they came to the Commission to get zoning on it and
8	get approval to use it as a campus plan. It's not the
9	kind of development we are talking about here.
10	You don't find people doing PUDs in R-1-A
11	or R-1-B, because the regulations are out of whack.
12	You get more as a matter of right than you get under
13	the PUD.
14	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Some other time
15	MR. SUEN: I'm not advocating it tonight
16	either.
17	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I wanted to
18	talk about the open space. I mean, some of it is very
19	well developed, congratulations. I mean, the design
20	of some of these open spaces, public spaces, are very
21	well done.
22	I wanted to explore the space you've given
23	to the large structure, I don't know what to call it,
24	what do you call it, the big structure, the historic
25	buildings, you must have a name for it.

1 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: The larger building. 2 MR. SUEN: The larger building and the 3 smaller building. COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Oh, come on, let's 4 5 give it a name. MR. SUEN: We haven't given it a name. 6 7 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Louie's Place. 8 MR. SUEN: We'll pick a name quickly. 9 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Why you didn't 10 choose to put the great lawn out in front of that, I 11 mean, it just -- to crowd it within 45 feet of the 12 front facade of that building, with townhouses a 13 parking lot for the townhouses, no sense of arrival, 14 no sense of place, it just -- it just doesn't work. 15 It's not the best piece of architecture I've ever seen, but it is grand, it sits there. 16 17 MR. FERRELL: I would tremble to disagree 18 with you about the appropriateness of it, but we 19 looked initially at putting a green in front of it, 20 there were issues with the topography, et cetera. 21 And, we think what you've got right now is a very 22 aggrandizing framing of the view with that street 23 leading up to the larger building. It is close, but the frame to view and the revealed view in the 24 25 contrast and scale will really aggrandize the view of

1 that building and frame it quite nicely. 2 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I guess we could just agree or disagree then. 3 4 MR. FERRELL: I hope. 5 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So, let's go to the great lawn, because I think I had some questions about 6 7 that, as set down, and no change has been made. So, it's 225 feet by 225 feet, now what do 8 9 you really imagine is going to happen here? Softball 10 games, pick-up soccer games, concerts, frisbee, what 11 is this community going to have to deal with when a 12 group of people from the neighborhood show up to have a football game? 13 14 MR. FERRELL: If I may, that's why it's 15 very important that that space has streets separating it from the buildings on three sides, and the layers 16 of trees and the tiered park separating it from the 17 18 first houses with the side porches facing it. There's 19 a clear enough separation that it's public, and what 20 you end up with a situation that's very common in the 21 District of Columbia, I'm thinking of Stanton Park, 22 with three sides instead of four with streets around 23 them. 24 So, human beings are human beings, and in 25 the future if you approve this there will be some

issues about how that is used. It's kind of a human problem, but it will be just like Stanton Park, et cetera, and with some of the other spaces, just like, for instance, the triangle parks that result from the L'Enfant plan, some of those are -- I know in my neighborhood, taken over by some of the residents who maintain them, but when the kids from two blocks, or six blocks, or you don't know where, perhaps, Germany, come through and play there and walk through it, that's a public space.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Well, I'm just anticipating what Mr. Jeffries was saying. I mean, it's just human nature that if 18 adults from another community show up to have a soccer game on a Saturday afternoon, there's going to be objection from the community, and that's what you are designing. You are designing a space that welcomes group sports, which is not what you want here, I don't think.

I mean, that's why I asked, what is the intent of this space?

MR. FERRELL: I think it is for informal group sports. It's really not big enough to have a real game, but our intent is that it's available, it's not programmed, it's there for people who want to come over and kick a soccer ball around, or play frisbee,

1 or play catch, et cetera, and people who live there 2 will have signed covenants when they first move in, up 3 front, that that's what it is. 4 MR. JARVIS: Mr. Commissioner, the purpose 5 really was for the enjoyment of green space, and if from a functionality standpoint it's not working it 6 7 seems to me we probably could maintain green space, 8 planting it a little bit differently. 9 We are not trying to have a place that will harbor bad activity, but on the other hand if you 10 11 are going to have green space, you are going to have 12 green space. And so, we are trying to figure out, you 13 know, what's the correct way to put green space into a community that people can use and enjoy. 14 15 And so, if you notice we have framed it with walkways and with other plantings, and with 16 17 design and landscaping that we are hopeful people 18 won't mistake this for a ball field, but would instead 19 utilize it as enjoyable green space to be in an urban 20 environment, and still have trees, grass, plantings, 21 et cetera. 22 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: All right. 23 MR. GLASGOW: Mr. Parsons, I think that 24 what we may want to do is, since depending upon the

status of the record at the end, at the conclusion, we

may want to propose an alternative plan for potentially landscaping part of that area so it is only usable for group activities, I'll call it, in smaller spaces, rather than a group coming in and saying here's our soccer ball, we are going to play, rather than if you've got certain plantings and that type of thing I think it will make that type of activity impossible, as opposed to just people going out and enjoying the green area.

commissioner parsons: I would certainly encourage that, and you've done that, I'm struggling to find the diagram of that triangular park. Help me, do you know what page that's on? I've got it, page S-14, so in this circumstance what you've done is to --if I grasp it, is a retaining wall that raises the center of the space, so you have two different levels. Is that correct?

MR. FERRELL: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So, what is the -- what is the elevation distance? Is this a seat wall, or is it a safety hazard, I guess.

MR. FERRELL: It's going to vary from side to side, because in general that's part of that 50-foot slope down to New Hampshire, and in some places it will be a seat wall, in other places it's quite

1 low. 2 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So, there's no 3 circumstance where you'd need a railing on it. 4 MR. FERRELL: No, we've avoided that. 5 COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So, that's a technique that would avoid exactly what I was talking 6 7 about earlier. I mean, it is that, it's a place for people to sun themselves, and have small activities, 8 9 and the great lawn is asking for something else, I 10 think. 11 But, I again, want to congratulate you so 12 many of the other spaces, I don't want to go into 13 them, I just think that they are very well done. 14 That's all I have. 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Do we have a list of all the things that will be planted on these, to 16 17 correspond to the landscaping plans that we have? 18 we have a list of plantings? 19 MR. FERRELL: It should be in the package. 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. In the big one 21 or in the supplemental? I just want to make sure that 22 we have that. 23 MR. FERRELL: We're checking. 24 MR. GLASGOW: My recollection is it's in 25 the large book, and we will try to get to the page.

me to that? I'm not going to have any questions, because that's not my bailiwick. MR. SUEN: It's on SO4, and the plans and details are on S20. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. MR. SUEN: The height slope and so forth are on SO4. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we had that. Okay. I just want to go back to something that I think you might have talked about this with Mr. Hood, but I wasn't following along carefully enough, so I wasn't grasping it. What in Square 3714, which is the bit of the development that's on the other side of Peabody, what does that back up to, what do those proposed townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is that the only thing	1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Could you just direct
MR. SUEN: It's on SO4, and the plans and details are on S20. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. MR. SUEN: The height slope and so forth are on SO4. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we had that. Okay. I just want to go back to something that I think you might have talked about this with Mr. Hood, but I wasn't following along carefully enough, so I wasn't grasping it. What in Square 3714, which is the bit of the development that's on the other side of Peabody, what does that back up to, what do those proposed townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	2	me to that? I'm not going to have any questions,
details are on S20. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. MR. SUEN: The height slope and so forth are on S04. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we had that. Okay. I just want to go back to something that I think you might have talked about this with Mr. Hood, but I wasn't following along carefully enough, so I wasn't grasping it. What in Square 3714, which is the bit of the development that's on the other side of Peabody, what does that back up to, what do those proposed townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	3	because that's not my bailiwick.
6 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. 7 MR. SUEN: The height slope and so forth 8 are on SO4. 9 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I just wanted 10 to make sure that we had that. 11 Okay. I just want to go back to something 12 that I think you might have talked about this with Mr. 13 Hood, but I wasn't following along carefully enough, 14 so I wasn't grasping it. 15 What in Square 3714, which is the bit of 16 the development that's on the other side of Peabody, 17 what does that back up to, what do those proposed 18 townhouses back up to? 19 MR. SUEN: There is one building at the 20 corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that 21 is a combination residence and dentist office. 22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached 23 residence? 24 MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	4	MR. SUEN: It's on S04, and the plans and
MR. SUEN: The height slope and so forth are on S04. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we had that. Okay. I just want to go back to something that I think you might have talked about this with Mr. Hood, but I wasn't following along carefully enough, so I wasn't grasping it. What in Square 3714, which is the bit of the development that's on the other side of Peabody, what does that back up to, what do those proposed townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	5	details are on S20.
are on S04. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we had that. Okay. I just want to go back to something that I think you might have talked about this with Mr. Hood, but I wasn't following along carefully enough, so I wasn't grasping it. What in Square 3714, which is the bit of the development that's on the other side of Peabody, what does that back up to, what do those proposed townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that we had that. Okay. I just want to go back to something that I think you might have talked about this with Mr. Hood, but I wasn't following along carefully enough, so I wasn't grasping it. What in Square 3714, which is the bit of the development that's on the other side of Peabody, what does that back up to, what do those proposed townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	7	MR. SUEN: The height slope and so forth
to make sure that we had that. Okay. I just want to go back to something that I think you might have talked about this with Mr. Hood, but I wasn't following along carefully enough, so I wasn't grasping it. What in Square 3714, which is the bit of the development that's on the other side of Peabody, what does that back up to, what do those proposed townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	8	are on S04.
11 Okay. I just want to go back to something 12 that I think you might have talked about this with Mr. 13 Hood, but I wasn't following along carefully enough, 14 so I wasn't grasping it. 15 What in Square 3714, which is the bit of 16 the development that's on the other side of Peabody, 17 what does that back up to, what do those proposed 18 townhouses back up to? 19 MR. SUEN: There is one building at the 20 corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that 21 is a combination residence and dentist office. 22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached 23 residence? 24 MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	9	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I just wanted
that I think you might have talked about this with Mr. Hood, but I wasn't following along carefully enough, so I wasn't grasping it. What in Square 3714, which is the bit of the development that's on the other side of Peabody, what does that back up to, what do those proposed townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	10	to make sure that we had that.
Hood, but I wasn't following along carefully enough, so I wasn't grasping it. What in Square 3714, which is the bit of the development that's on the other side of Peabody, what does that back up to, what do those proposed townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	11	Okay. I just want to go back to something
14 so I wasn't grasping it. 15 What in Square 3714, which is the bit of 16 the development that's on the other side of Peabody, 17 what does that back up to, what do those proposed 18 townhouses back up to? 19 MR. SUEN: There is one building at the 20 corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that 21 is a combination residence and dentist office. 22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached 23 residence? 24 MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	12	that I think you might have talked about this with Mr.
What in Square 3714, which is the bit of the development that's on the other side of Peabody, what does that back up to, what do those proposed townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	13	Hood, but I wasn't following along carefully enough,
the development that's on the other side of Peabody, what does that back up to, what do those proposed townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	14	so I wasn't grasping it.
what does that back up to, what do those proposed townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	15	What in Square 3714, which is the bit of
townhouses back up to? MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	16	the development that's on the other side of Peabody,
MR. SUEN: There is one building at the corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	17	what does that back up to, what do those proposed
corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	18	townhouses back up to?
is a combination residence and dentist office. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	19	MR. SUEN: There is one building at the
22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached 23 residence? 24 MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	20	corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Oneida Place that
residence? MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	21	is a combination residence and dentist office.
MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.	22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's a detached
	23	residence?
25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is that the only thing	24	MR. SUEN: Structure, yes.
	25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is that the only thing

1	there?
2	MR. SUEN: That's the only thing on the
3	rest of that block. I'm sorry, there's a house hidden
4	by if you look at SO4, it looks like there's a
5	house hidden by the tree, which I didn't see.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So, the
7	structure that is clearly apparent is the house and
8	the dentist's office, and then near the tree is
9	another.
10	MR. SUEN: Yes.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. And then,
12	moving, I guess, west on Peabody, so beyond the block
13	of the townhouses that are on the other side of
14	Peabody, and facing the balance of the project, what's
15	there? So, moving from 1st Street up to the Chillum
16	Place intersection on the south side of Peabody,
17	what's in that block front?
18	MR. JARVIS: Single-family homes.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Those are single-
20	family homes.
21	MR. JARVIS: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Single-family,
23	detached homes.
24	MR. JARVIS: Yes.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So, that's

where I needed some help, which is, in terms of facing like with like, which I think was one of the philosophies of the development, could you explain to me why in that section of Peabody, between 1st and Chillum Place, it's not facing like with like, and then why would we back up to, on the south side of Peabody, however many, like maybe townhouses, why would we back up to two detached homes with those? MR. FERRELL: May I answer the second question first? CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You can answer them in any order you like. MR. FERRELL: I think it's easier. In urban settings, and on blocks, the classic and the appropriate way to change scales and uses, it happens back at the alley, in backyards, quite often you'll see, you'll walk down one street, if you were to walk one block over those houses that face that street are of a different character, and the transition occurs at the rear lot line or at the alley. So, by our way of thinking, that's a normal and appropriate way to change uses. buildings themselves are the furthest distance from the neighbor, form that dentist's office/residence,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

with landscape, et cetera in between.

2.0

So, in terms of distance, it's a more comfortable relationship.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MR. FERRELL: The townhouses that are further as you go west up Peabody Street, Peabody Street, the idea that those are facing not exactly like directly across the street is what it is. Those are facing and siding those two houses.

I would point out, though, the next building up, and from there forward, starts with some kinds of industrial, I believe there's a car -- some kind of car working, car repair shop there, and further up the hill the lumber yard. So, there are two single-family houses facing there, but Peabody, as a street, and where it intersects with Chillum, gets to be a real mixed bag. So, it's not like we are facing townhouses to a real consistent, as you would have along New Hampshire, set of single-family houses. It's kind of a dog's breakfast.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I can appreciate that.

I guess one of the things, I guess there was a couple things. One is that it strikes me that for whatever the character of Peabody Street is, there is a single-family sort of character to it, at least for that

block, and we are adding to the mish-mash, instead of trying to clarify it. And, you know, I share some of Commissioner Turnbull's concern, and the concern that we all expressed at the set down, which is that this is awfully dense.

And so, and I think that when people, and there may be a completely different philosophy about this out there, but if you are in a neighborhood that's or a street that's kind of stressed because there's a lot of incompatible uses with residential, that you would actually benefit from more land around your house, rather than less, because it gives you a sense of more control and a buffer of some kind.

I'm sure there's urban planning arguments on the other side of that, but I'm just concerned about Peabody Street and the way that this seems to be making the site -- well, I find the site quite dense when you get into the townhouse portion of the development. And then, I agree with Mr. Turnbull that there's a few of these, and I don't want to get into picking out exactly which ones, but they do seem to be shoehorned in at various locations. So, I just wanted to make that statement.

Another thing, in addition to the concerns that we've had expressed to follow on, in terms of the

1	management of the community room, the management and
2	maintenance of the parks and landscaping and so on,
3	that we'll need to get more clarification on, I don't
4	know that you've clarified in the record what the
5	degree of affordability or length of the affordability
6	period that you are proffering for the affordable
7	units. Did I miss that?
8	MR. GLASGOW: I thought that we had that in
9	there, but with respect to the seniors building, I'll
10	call it that, with the 12 units?
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
12	MR. GLASGOW: That was going to be, what,
13	50 to 60 percent AMI?
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
15	MR. FERRELL: For, what was it, for eight
16	of those 12 units, okay?
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
18	MR. GLASGOW: And then for four of those
19	units, and the five townhouse units, were going to be
20	80 percent AMI.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And, for how long?
22	MR. GLASGOW: We were going to do that for
23	20 years.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And, did you were
25	you intending to put something in the record about how

1	all that we often get, you know, a few pages on how
2	all that's going to be managed and so on, were you
3	going to do that?
4	MR. GLASGOW: Yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, anyone
6	else have any follow-up questions?
7	Mr. Parsons?
8	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Yes, I just noticed
9	this, I'm looking at this landscape plan again, SO4,
10	and there is one parking lot shown in this entire
11	community, down at the northeast corner, and it backs
12	up to an existing house, and there's a shaded pattern
13	in its rear yard. So, I wondered, what was going on
14	there? Are you following me where that is?
15	MR. JARVIS: Yes.
16	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: One, why the parking
17	lot, and, two, what is the shading? Is there some
18	kind of a land exchange going on here?
19	MR. JARVIS: The shading portion is a land
20	exchange, yes, Mr. Commissioner.
21	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So, he or she gets
22	a backyard.
23	MR. GLASGOW: Yes.
24	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: They also have a
25	parking lot, so why is there this one parking lot in

1	the whole facility?
2	MR. FERRELL: The parking lot is there for,
3	simply put, extra parking. That's a little increment
4	for this concentration of townhouses, guest parking,
5	et cetera.
6	There's a factor of topography which makes
7	that set of head-in parking spaces not offensive to
8	that homeowner. So, there's a significant break at
9	that point.
10	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Because they are
11	above them or below them?
12	MR. FERRELL: Above him, and we are also
13	planting hedge material, so there will be screening in
14	addition to the change in topography.
15	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So, this becomes a
16	visitor parking, rather than resident overflow
17	parking, is that the intent?
18	MR. FERRELL: Or resident parking, it's
19	there to be used. We are trying to add to that 83,
20	unassigned.
21	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: So, is there a
22	retaining wall along the rear yard of this land
23	exchange?
24	MR. JARVIS: Yes.
25	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I see, so there's

substantial elevation. All right. And then on top of the retaining all would be some evergreen plant material or something to screen the bumpers of the cars.

MR. JARVIS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER PARSONS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Commissioner Turnbull.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank you, Madam

Chair.

I just wanted to get back to, I think, Mr. Parsons had some very good comments about some of the public spaces and the landscaping, and how they are really -- some of them work really well.

I guess getting back to an earlier concern that I had, I look on SO5, which is the next one after the general plan, which talks about Peabody Place, and again, you see this wonderful progression of material and the trees, and then you end up at the smaller remodeled or renovated existing building, and for lack of a term we could call it Mount Peabody, and you see the beginnings of a wonderful lawn out here in front of that building, but I guess what irritates me is then when I go back to SO4 I look at that building with -- it's got mainly a parking lot around it, but I see in the corner of it, and I don't know what you

1	call it, I think it's a single-family detached row
2	house. Is that a new term for us, a single-family
3	detached row house.
4	And, I just wonder, I want to take my
5	eraser and erase it.
6	MR. SUEN: We did.
7	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: And, I want to
8	erase the one across from it that stands on Chillum
9	Place. It looks like they are single-family
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think Mr. Suen said
11	they
12	MR. SUEN: In the June 28th supplement
13	plan, I think it's on the same sheet number, that
14	house is gone.
15	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: That house is gone.
16	MR. SUEN: So, we erased that.
17	MR. FERRELL: There a revised site plan of
18	that, SO4 on the submission, dated June 28th.
19	COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I guess we need a
20	score card to keep up with the revisions.
21	COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Very nice, thank
22	you.
23	What about the one across from it, any
24	chance you want to get rid of that one, too, while you
25	are at it? I don't know what that does over there.

2 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I see. 3 MR. GLASGOW: I think that the	
3 MR. GLASGOW: I think that the	
II	thought
4 there, Commissioner Turnbull, was since t	that one was
5 put on its side, it more looked like a si	ngle-family
6 house on there, as opposed to just looking	ng into the
7 site into a parking area for the senior of	citizen
8 housing project. So, there was some though	ght given to
9 that. We had a discussion with the Offic	ce of
10 Planning, it was determined that so, w	hat the
Commission does with it is one thing, but	it's not
it didn't just fall out of the sky there.	There was
some discussion about that.	
14 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay.	
MR. GLASGOW: And, the purpose	e that it
16 served.	
17 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Thank	you.
18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone el	se? Okay.
19 Commissioner Whiting, did you	ı have
where did you go, did you have any questi	ons at this
21 time, cross examination? Okay.	
22 And then, Yvonne Jefferson, y	ou need to
come forward, and you can ask cross exami	nation
24 questions.	
Give those to him. And, they	made room

1	for you at the table there, and I'm just going to give
2	you a tiny bit of coaching, since I think you might be
3	new to this, is you are asking them questions, you are
4	not making statements about your own opinions, okay?
5	Okay, just turn on the mic and state your
6	name for the record for us.
7	MS. JEFFERSON: Yvonne Jefferson.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Go ahead.
9	MS. JEFFERSON: I would like to go back to
10	the issue of community benefits. If the Applicant can
11	identify the community center that they pose to give
12	funds to and the location, name and location of that,
13	and what other benefits the Applicant is offering the
14	community.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Did you provide the
16	list of community benefits to Ms. Jefferson on behalf
17	of the party? Did you guys, when you passed it out to
18	us, did you give it to them?
19	Did you want to ask specific questions
20	about it, or you just want to get a copy of it?
21	MS. JEFFERSON: I have a copy now, I did
22	want to know what community center they were giving
23	funds to, proposing to give funds to. So, I guess
24	it's answered in this attachment?
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Would you turn your

1	mic back on, please?
2	MR. JARVIS: Sure, if you would like for me
3	to speak to it, it was to the Riggs LaSalle Recreation
4	Center, and to the Lamont Youth Program, in care of
5	the Lamont Community Development Corporation, and to
6	the Lamont-Riggs Athletic Association, and with
7	additional computers to LaSalle Elementary School, to
8	Whittier Elementary School, to Coolidge High School,
9	and signage for the community developed in conjunction
10	with the Lamont Community Action Group.
11	MS. JEFFERSON: Thank you.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, are those
13	MS. JEFFERSON: That's it.
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: that's it, okay,
15	great, thank you.
16	Okay, thank you all very much.
17	Now we are ready to move to the report by
18	the Office of Planning, Ms. Thomas?
19	MS. THOMAS: Good evening, Madam Chair,
20	Members of the Commission. I'm Karen Thomas, with the
21	Office of Planning.
22	The West*Group Development Company and
23	Jarvis Company propose a planned unit development, to
24	develop the subject site with 187 residential units,
25	with 61 of those to be assigned as senior housing in

the existing structures, 27 single-family detached homes, and 99 town homes on 55 lots, designed to create a diversity of residents of varying income levels.

Our report describes the type of housing proposed, and outlines where requested flexibility was required from several provisions of the Zoning Regulations, including lot occupancy for the town homes, new side yard requirements including the side yards for the town homes, FAR and flexibility from Sections 410 and 2516 of the Zoning Regulations.

OP did not have any objections to the flexibility requested, since we did not believe that they would aversely affect on the privacy, light and air to each unit. We are satisfied that decks have been included in the design, since this would eliminate future homeowners building and obtaining a variance or special exception approval to add a deck.

Further, as the Applicant sights some ratios, the total lot occupancy, and so the ratios are well within the range of the requirements.

The PUD process provides a comprehensive public review, that a proposal is reviewed according to its design, architecture and site planning, which would not otherwise be available if the project were

to be built as a matter of right.

The Applicant was informed that the project design should be able to achieve a development that would provide open space with additional shade tree plantings not currently on the site, on-site parking, pedestrian access, on-site storm water management control and erosion control.

Specifically, Chapter 24 provides that public benefits and project amenities may be exhibited and documented to its urban design. The Applicant has addressed the amenities, to its design environmental features, and affordable housing components.

At the request of the Commission and the Office of Planning, the Applicant was asked to address the density of the proposal, as well as to improve the open space features of the site, and an updated plan was submitted reducing the number of units from 199 shown at set down to 187, with about 11 park areas identified including its accessories.

A number of shade trees are proposed, not currently on the site, and this is a significant benefit to the community when it reaches -- when the canopy reaches maturity.

We supported the retention of the existing buildings on site, since they have been there since

1 1924, and to be used as senior housing seems 2 appropriate. 3 The two-entry story town homes have an 4 urban quality receptive of row house development in 5 the District. All vehicular access to the homes provided 6 7 through a 16-foot wide alley system. 8 Seventeen affordable units are proposed, 9 and DHC provided a recommendation regarding its 10 distribution. 11 OP focused on DDOTs comments, since the 12 community expressed concerns regarding the potential to increase traffic due to the development. 13 14 off, OP is satisfied that there is sufficient off-15 street parking provided and some on street for visitors in the neighborhood, and this would mitigate 16 overflow parking in the existing neighborhoods. 17 18 DDOT requested, and the Applicant has 19 agreed, to pedestrian enhancements, including upgraded 2.0 sidewalks and reflective striping, street crossings, 21 and the installation of a traffic light at Ouackenbos 22 and New Hampshire, as well as signs to prevent blocking at street intersections. The narrow streets 23 24 would also slow potential speeding to the

neighborhoods and OP is satisfied that the new streets

provide connectivity to the surroundings.

2.0

This is also a dispensable space issue, since dead-end streets present hazardous situations for law enforcement. More importantly, streets would be paved to DDOT standards and the maintenance agreement would have to be legally binding, as stated in DDOT's reports.

The generalized land use map recommended the subject site for low density residential, and the map amendment would rezone the site. OP understands that this has raised concerns with the community and overall site density of 0.77 FAR as proposed is within the range for the lower density zoned districts.

Therefore, OP believes that if the development meets the intent of the Comp Plan elements, and objectives, and the density for the site overall, it's within the range that could be supported by the land use map.

OP, therefore, supports the project as providing home ownership to a variety of potential residents, some of whom are seeking starter home, which seems to have become non-existent throughout the District and the Metro Area for low to middle income families. The variety of housing types would encourage long-term residency among middle income, first-time home buyers, to provide neighborhood

stability to this new development which would be situated among the long-established, stable residential neighborhoods that abut the proposed development.

Thank you.

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.

Questions for Ms. Thomas? Questions?

Okay, I just wanted to ask a question to follow up on the issue that I raised at set down, and the Applicant did provide us some additional information about the amount of the site, the area of the site net of the private streets and alleys, and they did that on page 4 of their latest submission. And, by my calculation the number of units per acre is 21 and a fraction, and at set down you represented that you were comfortable with the density on the site, because it was between the R-2 and R-3 density, and at the time it had been calculated at 17 units per acre, R-2 being 14 units per acre, and R-3 being 22 units per acre. Now it's really at the extreme of that range, which is, if R-3 is 22 units per acre this is 21 units per acre. How is it that you are comfortable with it, given that it's leaning very heavily in the R-3 direction?

MS. THOMAS: Well, again, we went back, we

looked at the FAR. If you did an R-2 PUD, R-2 PUD has an FAR of 0.6, an R-3 PUB has an FAR of 0.8, and the .77 proposed with this development falls between the R-2 PUD and the R-3 PUD. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I think some of the concern that's being expressed is the, not density in terms of mass of buildings, but in terms of number of families and people. And, you know, we have this kind of unusual condition where we have these structures that, clearly, it's in everybody's best interest to reuse them, and so we have some -- you know, we have some density being created by those But then, in addition to that, we have, you know, a lot of townhouses that are being introduced to the site, and, you know, there's concern being expressed, I mean, the Commission, I think, was pretty clear about this originally, and the community has only served to reinforce that as we've been able to get their concerns on the record, about changing the character of the neighborhood.

So, that's why I'm pressing you on this, because number of units does bear on the character of the neighborhood.

> MR. GLASGOW: Madam Chair, could I ask --CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm asking them right

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

now about their views, and you can add something on rebuttal.

MR. GLASGOW: I just wanted to make sure with the math, just because we have 11 acres times 17 units, and I think 11 times 17 is like 187.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Let me tell you the calculation that I did. I took the total lot area without alleys and driveways of 384,811 and did the calculation, units per acre using that number.

MS. STEINGASSER: I'm going to take a stab at answering that. We didn't feel the project as proposed would change the character of the existing neighborhood. The existing neighborhood is very well established. It's got wonderful urban fabric. I think most of these units were built in the '40s and '50s, and it's just got an overwhelming warmness to being in there. The old detached garages with the gates that open, and it's just -- it's a beautiful neighborhood back in there, and we were very sensitive to it. And, whenever I go back in there I'm really impressed by this neighborhood.

That was one of the reasons why we stressed so much for the single-family residential facing single family, and why I think the developer was very sensitive to that same juxtaposition of

having the single-family homes facing the single-family homes, and the row houses being internal.

It's a very large site, and the neighborhood is much larger than the site, and goes a great deal to the east and to the north, before we hit the Maryland line. And in containing the row houses within the center, with these variety of open spaces, we felt provided the housing opportunities that the District needs as a whole, but still protected the character of the neighborhood around the edges.

Another gesture that was made that we found highly significant and without -- I don't want to diminish the economic impact of it, is that these will be 100 percent masonry. They are not going to be a suburban model, where they've got a pastel vinyl siding around the back, they are going to be 100 percent masonry, which is the overwhelming material of the surrounding neighborhood. So, they were very sensitive to bringing that in.

We didn't feel the internal part of the lot, or of the project, was over dense, while we agreed there were some awkward units, and many of them have since been removed. We thought about neighborhoods like up on middle Wisconsin, where you've got Glover Park that has a mixture of 1910,

1920 homes with the 1890 row houses, and they are really together, and it's a really wonderful neighborhood. And, if you stepped back and tried to describe the neighborhood we'd all cock our heads as if it was something odd to have this combination of units and opportunities with open spaces. This particular park and this relationship is very common throughout D.C. It's a very familiar pattern throughout the City. We see it up in parts of Ward 4 especially, the east side of the park where you've got blocks of row houses, a central park, detached single-family units, and they are all of masonry materials, and it's very familiar.

Capitol Hill is just littered with these central parks in the neighborhoods, especially if they come through on the diagonal. So, we felt this was a familiar pattern to Washington. We felt the density wasn't too great, it was contained within the project, not on the edges, and so they kind of bore their own transition internally.

We felt it also opened itself up, as Mr. Ferrell was explaining, by continuing the grid wherever they could. They are pulling it in, it's not a grid site. It's not rectilinear, it's not in the original L'Enfant, it doesn't naturally lend itself to

a full continuation, without the demolition of some of the buildings that the Applicant and the City was hoping to see reused.

So, we had a more -- I guess we had less concern about the density than the Commission does. We felt that some of the units without yards were opportunities for people who don't want to maintain the yards. They've still got more open space, they've got a garage and a drive through, than an apartment dweller would have, or a condominium owner who has no outdoor space.

We were also pleased to see, since the set down, that the developer reoriented most of those units so that faced directly onto the open space, so that there was at least a visual sense of openness, and they weren't necessarily tucked away in some areas where they had been before with no direct link to the open space.

I think also as the Applicant had offered, some of the concerns about the use of the larger lawn, and I hadn't really thought through the soccer issue, but can be resolved by putting in some small groups of trees. It still makes the lawn open, but it divides the lot up so that it's not available for that kind of public soccer, baseball use, and creates smaller areas

2.0

1	but still maintains that kind of majestic open lawn
2	that would welcome the neighborhood in.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
4	Anyone else?
5	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I'd just ask Ms.
6	Steingasser, so, in terms of Madam Chair's concern
7	about Peabody Street, could you comment at all on sort
8	of this whole notion of Peabody Street, and not sort
9	of doing that sort of likeness across from it?
10	MS. STEINGASSER: I guess when we looked at
11	at least the piece of Peabody between 1st and
12	Chillum, there as a transition that was needed between
13	the existing smaller building that's there, at the
14	corner of Chillum and Sligo Mill, and how to
15	transition from this building to the single-family
16	detached on Peabody. And, Peabody seemed to be a
17	natural breaking point, and again, the transition
18	happened on the site with the row houses.
19	In this particular case, there's only the
20	four row houses and then the I'm still confused
21	whether the detached row house is in or out. I got a
22	little confused.
23	MR. GLASGOW: It's in.
24	MS. STEINGASSER: It is in?
25	MR. GLASGOW: That one is in.

MS. STEINGASSER: And, on this one, this
one OP had originally asked that this unit come out,
and as the planning philosophy was explained to us
about having eyes on the street, connecting to the dog
park across which is in the corner of Chillum Place,
it kind of was connecting the neighborhood out, it was
kind of an important unit as it turned out to pulling
the neighborhood across Chillum, as opposed to had it
been out then there would just be there would be an
open space, or parking, or just a big landscaped
space, and the dog park would seem more of kind of a
detached afterthought than actually being relative to
the street.
The other four units we saw as serving
that transition between the single family and this
larger multi-family mid-rise building.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
Anyone else?
Mr. Parsons?
COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I find it curious
that they haven't included a playground for small
children. Is there one in the neighborhood?
MS. STEINGASSER: I don't know.
COMMISSIONER PARSONS: I'll ask the
Applicant. I'm sorry.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Glasgow, did you
2	have any questions for the Office of Planning? This
3	is not a time to answer the questions, just to we
4	actually have some like order to it.
5	MR. GLASGOW: I have no questions.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
7	Commissioner Whiting, did you have any
8	questions for the Office of Planning?
9	Okay, and, Ms. Jefferson, any questions
LO	for the Office of Planning?
L1	Okay, thank you.
L2	The next is Government Agency reports,
L3	there are a number of Government Agency reports
L4	attached to the Office of Planning report, and we have
L5	the DDOT report in the record separately.
L6	Is there anyone here representing any of
L7	the agencies that submitted reports? Okay.
L8	No, ma'am, if you have a procedural
L9	question you can ask Ms. Schellin, you can walk up and
20	ask Ms. Schellin.
21	Okay, then we will skip over the time for
22	the ANC report, as we said, and now we'll take folks
23	in support, and I have Mr. White representing the
24	Lamond Community Action Group, Stan Vondrie, you can
25	come forward folks if you intend to testify you can

1 come forward now. 2 Anyone else who would like to testify in If you'd hand your two cards over to the 3 4 court reporter there. Are you Mr. White? 6 MR. WHITE: Yes, I am. 7 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, would you turn 8 on the mic and introduce yourself, please? 9 MR. WHITE: Good evening, my name is Keith 10 White. I'm the Vice President of the Lamond Community 11 Action Group. 12 The Lamond Community Action Group is a 13 non-profit, non-partisan organization consisting of 14 home and apartment residences within the 4B07 15 community of the District of Columbia. Our communitybased organization has been in existence since 1965, 16 17 and consists of approximately 175 single-family homes, 18 duplexes and apartments. We are committed to 19 improving quality of life for our residents. 20 Please note the LCAG is bounded by Kansas 21 Avenue, Eastern Avenue, New Hampshire Avenue, Peabody 22 Street and Chillum Road. Currently, we have about 40 23 active participants in our organization. 24 The LCAG is in support of Case No. 0530, 25 our decision is based upon a community survey within the organization and conversations with the West*Group and based among ourselves. We have spent a lot of time conversing and surveying also to determine what we would like to see in a development, and how it will affect our neighborhood.

We view this development as a positive addition to a community and the City that is changing for the better.

Many concerns were raised and submitted to the West*Group for implementation into their design of the property, and they have responded to our recommendations. The concerns raised were density, appearance of the homes, cost of the homes, road infrastructure, traffic capacity, green space and commercial or retail components in a development.

They reduced the overall housing stock from 287 units down to 187 units. Ideally, we would have liked to have seen a better mix of single-family homes and townhouses, i.e., 50 single-family homes, 70 town homes.

The increase in the green space and a guarantee to the community that it will be open for public use alleviated our concerns of a closed development and de-permanization of the community. We also recommended that all of the homes should be brick

2.0

1	with town homes having some green space, similar to
2	duplexes in the neighborhood. The West*Group complied
3	as it ensured that the houses will have at least one
4	dedicated parking space on the property of the home.
5	Finally, the commercial and retail
6	components were removed from the project, as we
7	requested.
8	The LCAG has always known that the
9	West*Group was seeking a PUD, and in essence asking
10	for a zoning change in exchange for community input
11	and benefits. We have worked with the West*Group,
12	their team and the community leaders, to ensure that
13	the project would reflect the surrounding community
14	and be a positive impact upon us.
15	We ask that the Zoning Commission approve
16	this planned use development.
17	Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. White.
19	Questions from the Commission for Mr.
20	White? Any questions?
21	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Mr. White, you said
22	that your organization consists of residents who live
23	in ANC 4, what was it, 4B07?
24	MR. WHITE: That's correct, sir.
25	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, thank you.

1	Thank you, Madam Chair.
2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is there overlap
3	between the area of your group and the area
4	represented by Citizens Aware Block Organization?
5	MR. WHITE: No, we are separated by New
6	Hampshire Avenue.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Okay. And, how
8	did you all, given that you said that you had a
9	preference, initially there was a preference expressed
10	for more single-family dwellings, how did you all come
11	to sort of resolve among yourselves that the density
12	was acceptable?
13	MR. WHITE: We debated, and we talked about
14	the number of units, ideally we would have liked to
15	have seen more. We saw a benefit in having a mixed-
16	used development, and that different price ranges and
17	different folks coming into the community, a much more
18	diverse community, than in an all single-family
19	development.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, that's how you
21	MR. WHITE: Yes.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: got comfortable
23	with it?
24	MR. WHITE: Yes.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anyone else?

1	Okay, Mr. Glasgow, any questions?
2	MR. GLASGOW: No questions.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Commissioner Whiting,
4	any questions for Mr. White?
5	Okay, Ms. Jefferson, any questions for Mr.
6	White?
7	Okay, thank you very much.
8	Anyone else who would like to testify in
9	support?
10	Okay, now we will take the party in
11	opposition first. Ms. Jefferson, as a party, you have
12	15 minutes to make a presentation, and you can call
13	the witnesses that you indicated on your party status
14	application as you wish.
15	MS. JEFFERSON: Good evening. My name is
16	Yvonne Jefferson, and if I could I'd like to have my
17	witnesses called up.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's fine.
19	MS. JEFFERSON: That would be Lawrence
20	Martin, Archie Pritchard, Mr. Johnson, Dr. Martin,
21	Rabiha Matin, if she's here, and if I've forgotten
22	anyone, and you know you are a witness if you would
23	please come up.
24	Can I call witnesses that I hadn't
25	previously asked

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Do you have any
2	objection to that, Mr. Glasgow?
3	MR. GLASGOW: No, Madam Chair, as long as
4	they keep within their time limit.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right.
6	MS. JEFFERSON: Okay.
7	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You have to manage
8	your time.
9	MS. JEFFERSON: Okay.
10	And, Ms. Griffin and Judi Jones.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And, since this is an
12	awful lot of people to get into 15 minutes, I'll just
13	say that anybody that you don't get to can testify as
14	an individual on their own, if we don't get to them.
15	Okay? So, hit it hard in your 15 minutes, okay?
16	MS. JEFFERSON: Okay. I am Yvonne
17	Jefferson, and I am representing Citizens Aware, which
18	is in the 4B08 community. We have previously
19	submitted a testimony and attached to that testimony
20	were 272 signed petitions by members that live in the
21	community that may or may not be part of an organized
22	group that are in opposition to having the West*Group
23	build a project that is a PUD.
24	West*Group stated that they have held 20
25	meetings in our community, and I would proffer that

someone from Citizens Aware would have been at any one of those meetings. I probably attended at least 18 of them myself, and they probably made changes to their proposal at at least 17 of those meetings. So, you had to go to the meeting, because at each meeting they would change their proposal.

We got -- I live right across the street from the property on New Hampshire Avenue -- I received a notice of zoning change on the property in August, 2005. We had been in negotiations with West*Group for about a year before I was informed that there would be a zoning change that would come along with this planned unit development.

West*Group was wrong about the commercial strip, and in one of their plans they proposed that we should have a commercial strip, that we might have a cleaners, a store, the community resoundingly did not want that.

They were wrong about a park. They came in and proposed that maybe we wanted a park on this PUD. We've had a lot of problems with drugs in our community and parks being one of the places where they are sold and used. And so, that idea left a bad taste in our mouths.

We also, I think, negotiations kind of

broke down, and the reason we had to have so many meetings is because West*Group negotiated with individual members of the community and they negotiated with this group one month, that group the next month. Originally, we had been led to believe that there would be an ad hoc committee of community leaders, and we think that would have been a better way to negotiate the process.

This project, we are against this project because the zoning variance would dramatically increase the community population. It would double the number of households in our community.

According to West*Group, 80 single-family homes could be built on that property were the two buildings allowed -- they would be allowed to stay there. If they demolish those two buildings then 100 single-family homes could be built on this property.

We agree with Commissioner Turnbull's testimony earlier that a zoning for variance under the PUD would result in crammed buildings or buildings that look crammed together, where alleys in the back and front entrances would be cut off, they would not be uniform, you might have one that has a backyard and then another that does not.

And also, the private streets would make

2.0

it -- private streets don't exactly conform to streets that would normally be built in a community, so you would have a tight fit there.

This project cannot be everything to everybody. The City, as we all know, has adopted a pro development strategy, and you can see the development coming up all over the City. It seems that Ward 4 has been especially targeted at an alarming rate for new development. There are a number of mixed use housing developments, condos and townhouses that are being considered for construction in our area, not more than four to six blocks away from this project. Some of that construction, or proposed construction, is taking place at South Dakota and Ridge Road, N.E., over at the Fort Totten Metro they are actually turning dirt to make these projects happen.

Accordingly, we are concerned about increased density in the short and long term in our community. With the increased density there would be lots of concerns that may come up. One of them would be more traffic. In the last ten years we've had the subway come in, and it's probably been longer than that, but we have more traffic coming through our neighborhood streets, the side streets off of New

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Hampshire Avenue. We have a post office over on the Kansas Avenue side that causes traffic. Two streets, Peabody Street and Quackenbos, going for a two-block area you get to Eastern Avenue, which becomes like a gateway to Maryland, and people are using these side streets more and more to commute into D.C. from Maryland and then go back into Maryland in the afternoon hours.

Also, there is a proposed light to be built at Quackenbos and New Hampshire. We think that will further exacerbate traffic, because once you come into D.C., at the Eastern Avenue point, from Eastern Avenue to North Capitol Street is about a six-block area, North Capitol is a busy thoroughfare, and there's a light there. So, that light, and it's kind of a dead end in the sense that there's a house on North Capitol, it's kind of a T-shaped, New Hampshire Avenue, you are coming in going south in D.C., and then North Capitol runs along, it would be the top of the T. And, in rush hour it tends to back up traffic, because it has no where to go until you wait for those lights.

In addition, there will be more pets, more children, more waste, more water to consider, more emergency services. We have had the police come into

our community meetings and tell us they did not
anticipate any increased crime in our area, and we all
know what a farce that is after the crime tragedies
that have occurred in our neighborhoods these last few
weeks, where the police have been diverted from parks
in our neighborhood to go down to the Mall area.
We've also had police come in and tell us that the
crime rate is not as high in the New Hampshire Avenue
Gateway as it is in the Georgia avenue Gateway, so
when there is something going on in Georgia Avenue
they pull the police out of our neighborhood and send
them over to the Georgia Avenue neighborhood.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I'm just going to help
you manage your time a little bit, you are about
halfway done, and you haven't called any of your
witnesses.
MS. JEFFERSON: All right.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So, I just want to
help you.
MS. JEFFERSON: And so, with that, I would
wrap up, because I do want to have the testimony of my
other members. We want to thank West*Group for
presenting their project and thank the Zoning Board
for hearing us on this.
One of the big lessons that we have
·

1	learned is that home is where the heart is, home is
2	right up there with mom and apple pie. One of our
3	members said they intend to die in that community, and
4	it has been a strong, stable community, and we would
5	like to keep it like it is.
6	We would propose that West*Group, and we
7	would work with them to develop this project as a
8	matter of right, as all single-family homes.
9	And, at this time I'll call on Dr. Martin.
10	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Would you turn on your
11	microphone?
12	DR. MARTIN: Because I signed up as an
13	individual, I think because of time I would like to
14	let, you know, Mr. Martin go.
15	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: However you want to do
16	it.
17	DR. MARTIN: And, I'll come back as an
18	individual.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's fine.
20	DR. MARTIN: Okay.
21	MR. MARTIN: Commissioner
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You can bend it, you
23	can move it around. There you go.
24	MR. MARTIN: Commissioner Mitten, and
25	Members of the Zoning Commission, good evening. I am

Lawrence L. Martin, a member of Citizens Aware, a block organization since 1962, of the Lamond-Riggs Citizens Association. I have been presently a resident of the District of Columbia some 85 plus years, 48-1/2 of those at my present location, 301 Quackenbos Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20011-1653 in Ward 4, Single Member District 4B08.

I am homeowner living one block from the proposed West*Group development. One of my major concerns involving the project is population density, resident occupancy. For the proposed development, which would be located in Census Track 4505 in Ward 4, the proposed development would include 27 single-family homes, approximately 100 townhouses, and 60 condominiums. Research, using suggested national standards of approximately three persons per single-family home, two and a half persons per townhouse, and one and a half persons per condominium would total between 371 and 401 persons residing on 11.2 acres of land and building.

I have a map, an Office of Planning map, dated July 17, 2006, which depicts population density of Ward 4 as 13 persons per acre, and for Census Track 9505, Ward 4, in which the development is proposed, is 10.5 persons per acre.

2.0

Noting the density figures just given, the population density for the project would range from 31.5 to 35.8 persons per acre, more than three times the current population density for Track 9505 and almost two and a half times the population density for Ward 4, creating a disparity that in my view exasperates, not only the housing situation, but other related problems associated with proposed development.

This situation is germane to the traffic problem. Increased traffic to an over-burdened

problem. Increased traffic to an over-burdened system, which currently and in the foreseeable future is unable to adequately handle the a.m./p.m. rush hour traffic that flows to and from the downtown area of our City.

The proposed project is bounded by local streets, New Hampshire Avenue, Peabody, Chillum Place, and Sligo Mill Road, respectively. Rittenhouse, between New Hampshire and Kansas Avenue, would also be affected by the proposed development. Local streets, by definition, are supposed to offer lowest level mobility and service to through traffic movement, usually deliberately discouraged. This is from a DOT printout.

Homes adjacent to the proposed development, older homes, have plastered walls.

Excess traffic causes, on some streets, to develop a corridor effect, thereby causing cracks in walls in homes that the District Government will not repair.

An example, 60 23rd St., N.E., the local streets in my view are not designed to carry excess traffic.

In order to circumvent the heavy traffic on New Hampshire Avenue, N.E., during the rush hour periods, many drivers violate established "do not enter" signs, electronic or posted, which are supposed to deter entry of traffic into the community during the 7:00 a.m. and 9:30 time period. Demographics have changed remarkably in terms of population density, traffic patterns and systems, and in other areas since the 2000 Census, as suggested in terms of accuracy in the D.C. Atlas publication dated November, 2005.

The proposed cost of housing for persons buying into the proposed development may require the additions of more persons per unit than anticipated to meet high mortgage obligations.

In conclusion, members of Citizens Aware, and residents beyond our immediate block organization boundaries, as supported by 272 signed petitions, are trying desperately to maintain the integrity of our community, by asking that the Commission give great thought before making a determination to grant the

1	zoning from current R-1-B to 5-R-A or B. We truly
2	love our community, and hope that R-1-B zoning will
3	remain.
4	Thank you. Respectfully submitted,
5	Lawrence L. Martin.
6	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
7	Did you have anyone else you wanted to
8	call at this point, or will they just testify as
9	individuals?
10	MS. JEFFERSON: We don't have much time, so
11	I think they'll just testify as individuals, they
12	have, what, two minutes?
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Three minutes, and I
14	need you to pull that microphone closer as you
15	respond.
16	MS. JEFFERSON: Okay.
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So, you'll
18	close out now, and then we can pick these other folks
19	up as individuals.
20	MS. JEFFERSON: Okay.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
22	MS. JEFFERSON: Do you want me to close
23	out?
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Do you have you can
25	just give us your final thought.

1 MS. JEFFERSON: We are concerned about, as 2 the Commission testified, about the condo association 3 being responsible for certain items. We don't think 4 it's likely to have people coming into the community 5 and wanting to have to pay for that. Also, private streets are proposed, that 6 7 means those condo residents would have to pay for snow removal, repairs of streets, and such like that, and 8 9 you may have people cutting through the development to 10 duck some of the traffic that we know that they will 11 face. And so, that is a concern for us. 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Let's -- we'll have our questions for Ms. Jefferson and Mr. Martin, 13 14 and then we'll hear the testimony from the other 15 folks. Any questions for either of these folks? 16 17 Any questions? 18 Mr. Jeffries? 19 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I have a question. 2.0 Ms. Jefferson, you state 272 residents, I 21 mean, can you just give me a sense of exactly what was 22 -- what did you ask of these 272 residents, as it 23 relates to this development? I'm trying to get a 24 sense of what it means that 272 residents, you know, 25 stated that they were against a zoning change, is that

what you said?

MS. JEFFERSON: Actually, Dr. Martin initiated that project. She is a member of Citizens Aware, and I would defer the question to her, but I would just say first of all, everybody that is affected and lives in the community is not part of an organized community organization. So, I think the benefit of those petitions is the voice of those people that are not part of an organized group are being heard through their signature on these petitions, and at this time I will pass --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: She hasn't testified yet, so if you can incorporate that into your testimony -- that response into your testimony.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: It's really around
-- I just want to understand the methodology, in terms
of, you know, how you came about, you know, because
272, I mean, that seems pretty large, but so, it makes
you sort of wonder exactly how you went about that.

And, my other question, Ms. Jefferson, is that I think the Applicant has testified that, you know, because of the PUD, and the map amendment, that the community will get a number of benefits. I mean, the pocket parks, the green lawn, the great lawn, I'm sorry, affordable housing, so all those things, you

know, might go away if we were looking at a matter of right development. I mean, have you sort of considered, you know, the attractiveness of some of the benefits and amenities that are being offered through this PUD?

MS. JEFFERSON: Actually, there is, there's been a number of questions about the parks, and just how much benefit they will be to the community. It has to be worked out, I believe, with the new residents that will be coming in and having to pay the condominium fee to maintain those green spaces and that shrubbery that's there.

And, the issue of affordable housing, when West*Group came in and presented their PUD, they had no affordable housing. They did not offer that. That was a suggestion of the community.

The community voted for ten affordable housing units, and at that time were hoping that women, children would benefit from that. A recent development has been that 12 of the 17, I believe, affordable housing units are going to seniors. So, that leaves out a number of people that would benefit from the affordable housing units, and those 12 are being offered as condominiums. You have five townhouses that really would be available to the

1 public as affordable housing units, and I don't think 2 that's significant when you are talking 200 3 households. 4 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Anyone else? Mr. Hood? 6 7 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: I have question. 8 Ms. Jefferson, you mentioned about, 9 roughly, 18 meetings, and 17 changes. Was that due to 10 the group being conscientious of what the community 11 input was, and they made the changes because of the 12 input that they got? Would you say that's a fair 13 assessment? 14 MS. JEFFERSON: I think that's a fair 15 assessment, and I will quantify that the 17 and 18 figures that I used were just kind of like off the top 16 17 of my head. But, the point I was making was that 18 there were several revisions to these changes, and, 19 yes, the changes were made as a request of individuals 2.0 that might have come to a meeting in January. And 21 then, somebody didn't come in January may have come in 22 February, and it went on like that. A group may have 23 come in March. 24 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right, so this 25 developer changed, trying to work with the input of

1	the community.
2	MS. JEFFERSON: Yes, he did.
3	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Thank you.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else?
5	Mr. Glasgow, any questions?
6	Ms. Whiting, did you have any questions
7	for either Ms. Jefferson or Mr. Martin?
8	Okay, thank you. You both can go back and
9	have a seat, and then we'll just have this panel.
10	I don't know everyone's name, so maybe we
11	can work from Dr. Martin, if you want to go first,
12	that's fine, too.
13	DR. MARTIN: Okay. I'm Dr. Oralisa Martin,
14	a D.C. resident, located across the street from the
15	said property at 6101 New Hampshire Avenue.
16	It's important to understand that on
17	September 22, 2005, I, with Dr. A. Kelly, on behalf of
18	the citizens who comprise this community of the
19	Lamond-Riggs subdivision, submitted to the District of
20	Columbia Zoning Commission 272 adult-signed petitions
21	in opposition to Zoning Application Case 0530.
22	The process used, in answer to the
23	question, was door to door, knocking on doors, talking
24	to people about the new development as was presented
25	to us, and to be clear, we went almost a whole year of

a PUD image that looked like a glorified spider web placed on a screen, with us supposedly commenting on what we liked and what we didn't like, whether we liked the trees and all of this stuff, and then revisions. So, we are constantly reacting, just as coming in here.

When I sit in this assembly, and listen to the experts, yourselves, asking pertinent questions that people like myself and those behind me were expected to catch in order to make a decision, we understood that we needed that piece of property to remain R-1-B zoning, because it protected us and it protected our rights.

We also felt that we were violated, because we went through a process looking at a PUD a whole year, and it wasn't until August 31st that we learned this required a changed in zoning. And, for people who oppose, we really didn't get much of a voice.

Okay, and when I realized that we weren't getting much of a voice in organizations, moved out with several people and we did door-to-door knocking until 10:00-11:00 at night.

And, because I don't really work an 8:00 to 5:00 job, and Dr. Kelly had time off, too, and

1 three other persons with me, we worked it and talked 2 to people, and discussed it with them on the street, 3 in the household, risking life on what was going to 4 happen to our community. 5 And, we need to say to the Zoning Commission, we looked at the project as a monster, 6 7 sitting in the middle of our community. When people talk about not wanting to cut grass and a lawn, that's 8 9 part of our character, and the value. 10 And so, this project looks like a monster, 11 and which many people who are elders feel terrorized. 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Dr. Martin, I need 13 your closing thought. 14 DR. MARTIN: Okay. My closing thought is 15 that we, the hard-working residents of D.C., continue to look to our Zoning Commission, and the elected 16 officials, to protect us from the violation of our 17 18 rights. And, we urge you to not grant a rezoning of 19 the said property, and to vote that it retains its 20 zoning R-1-B. 21 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 22 Ma'am, are you Dr. Kelly? No, okay. 23 we'll have you go next. I'm sorry. You can stay 24 right there, we'll just slide the mic over. 25 MS. GRIFFIN: Yes, my name is Pamela

Griffin. I live at 6119 New Hampshire Avenue, and I am very concerned about the amount of traffic it's going to bring to our community, which is already overly burdened. There are a lot of accidents.

People are hurt very badly at the intersection, right at New Hampshire and Rittenhouse. That's where my house is, right on that corner, and you hear ambulances.

I know people personally who have been in accidents on that corner, and I think adding that many people to that area right there could only make it worse. I don't see how anything that's being done there can make that situation any better.

And, the houses do -- they do shake, and I'm really worried with this magnitude of a construction over at that site, what it's going to do to the houses below. There's a big construction going on on South Dakota Avenue, at the end of South Dakota Avenue, next to Fort Lincoln, and when it rains that area is just mud, just comes down over there. One time they had to close the street off. I'm very concerned with what's going to happen, because that is on a hill, what is going to happen with that magnitude, and this is probably going to happen with any type of development over there.

1 But, we've done a lot to our houses in 2 that neighborhood to waterproof and that type of thing, I know I have with my house, and I'm very 3 4 worried about runoff and that type of thing, 5 especially during the construction phase of the 6 project. 7 And, it was given that zone for a reason. 8 Every neighborhood has a zone for a reason, and I 9 don't see a reason to change our zone. There are other communities all over the City that have a zone, 10 11 they stay that zone, and when there is a change about 12 a lot of people are opposed to it, because we moved 13 there for a reason, we moved there because that was 14 the zone, and that's where we wanted to live. 15 So, I don't see a valid reason for changing the zone. 16 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, thank you, Ms. 17 18 Griffin. Just hold your seat, and then we'll take 19 questions for the whole panel together. 2.0 Sir? MR. JOHNSON: Good evening, my name is 21 22 Willard Johnson. I have lived at 6128 New Hampshire 23 Avenue, N.E., for 42 years. As a matter of fact, I 24 live in one of the three houses that you saw on the

map down at the bottom of the hill.

1 I just learned today that that is a 50-2 foot slope that's coming down toward me, and so I 3 didn't know exactly what the slope, you know, how much 4 of a slope it is. But, I will say this, I have noticed over the years a tremendous increase in the volume of 6 7 traffic coming out of Maryland into the District, particularly, during the morning and evening hours 8 between 6:30 and 9:00 a.m., and 3:30 to 6:30 p.m. 9 10 To complicate things, New Hampshire Avenue 11 is a bus route to Fort Totten. There are several bus 12 stops southbound and northbound inside the District 13 line between Eastern Avenue and North Capitol Street. 14 Buses, as you know, make frequent stops, and will 15 delay traffic in an already crowded situation. I have not been able, of course, to count 16 17 the traffic, but there is a steady flow of traffic, 18 bumper to bumper, coming into the District, blocking 19 driveways and streets, and sometimes, you know, 20 intersections. When the light turns green, they are 21 already out there, and so they are blocking that. 22 Now, travelers, as I heard my neighbors 23 mention, they make an effort to avoid the delay by 24 negotiating through other streets in the community in

order to get downtown.

Currently, with bumper-to-bumper cars, 1 2 buses, heavy-duty trucks, and other types of 3 conveyances, now additional traffic entering New 4 Hampshire, N.E. Corridor would only serve to add to 5 the pollution problem. I haven't heard pollution mentioned here, but there is a tremendous pollution 6 7 problem, you know, with the slow trucks coming through, and it's definitely having an effect on human 8 I haven't heard that mentioned. 9 health. 10 But, this proposed development would add, 11 with an additional 400 new residents in my view would 12 add an additional impact on the above-mentioned 13 problem. 14 Now, it was mentioned that those five 15 exits, you know, it sounds good on paper, but actually 16 they can't go through there because it's going to --17 they'd be blocked up over there trying to get out on 18 the cycle of Kansas, because it's already bumper to 19 bumper. 2.0 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I need your closing 21 thought, Mr. Johnson. 22 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. 23 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. 24 MR. JOHNSON: All right, thank you. 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, thank you.

1	Ms. Jones, Commissioner Jones?
2	MS. JONES: Yes. I want to, I know that I
3	have to at the end of the meeting talk about my area,
4	but I'd like to stop for a minute and ask Ms.
5	Jefferson what she wanted me I was an impromptu
6	witness, so I wanted to know what you wanted me to
7	talk about at this point.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Well, I want to
9	clarify something. You can the ANC will have
10	official testimony, and that will take place at our
11	hearing on the 7th. If you desire tonight to testify
12	as a Single-Member District Commissioner or as an
13	individual, you can do that, and it's whatever you
14	want to say.
15	MS. JONES: And, that's what I understood
16	that you were going to, at the end of after
17	everyone's testimony, have that. So, I'm asking
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, the official ANC
19	testimony is what is being held out of order.
20	MS. JONES: so I can testify now.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: As an individual you
22	can testify now for three minutes.
23	MS. JONES: Right. Well again, I wanted to
24	ask what I can talk all day as a resident, but Ms.
25	Jefferson called me up as a witness, so I wanted to

1 know if she had anything specific she wanted me to 2 say. 3 MS. JEFFERSON: I just wanted your 4 thoughts. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, the answer is 5 6 no. Okay, thanks. Go ahead. 7 MS. JONES: Okay. So, as a resident, I have been involved in this, I've lived in D.C. all my 8 life, but I moved into the area in 1999, and I really 9 10 like the community. I live in the Parkview area, Park 11 Morgan area, for ten years previous to that, so I'm 12 really happy with the community in which I live. 13 And, we are a community of neighbors, and 14 even though I'm a representative, I'm also a resident, 15 and this is going to be in my backyard, and so I have a vested interest for two reasons. 16 17 There are, on that property, that is a 18 huge green space which the community has enjoyed since 19 I've been there, and they have enjoyed it over time, 20 but to have them -- what you didn't see on the screen 21 over there was that -- or didn't notice, was that 22 there are two single-family dwellings on that lot, and 23 they plan to tear them down to enlarge a building that we don't want. And so, the traffic, he has not been 24

asked about the parking spaces behind his house, those

1 parking spaces that one of the Commissioners asked 2 about on the drawing on SO4, that he wasn't asked 3 about it. I asked him if he knew anything about that, 4 and there was no permission. So, I'm saying there is -- there should be -- our community is much more than houses. It's much 6 7 more than a homeowners' fee, or a virtual gated 8 community, and we have a lot at stake, and I would not 9 like to see that materialize into a battle over a 10 green space. 11 I appreciate the green space, but it is --12 our conversations within my community have been halted at the homeowners' fee, and what is probably going to 13 14 be a battle in the future. 15 Our community gets together once a year for community day, we have a Gospel Festival, we just 16 17 opened a rec center, and by the way, they just paved 18 our street. I feel like we have the last paved street 19 in Washington. So, in that way, we are a country 20 town, in that we are just now getting the street 21 scapes, the alleys, and our entire community together. 22 So, this plan, as a resident, doesn't know 23 the outside of that 11.2 acres, and so I wish that my 24 recommendation as a resident is that you reject this

plan and allow the West*Group to come back to the

1	community and negotiate a more community-friendly
2	plan.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
4	Questions for this panel from the
5	Commission? Any questions?
6	Mr. Jeffries.
7	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: A question for Dr.
8	Martin. I just want to make certain I'm clear, did
9	you tally those individuals that you discussed with
LO	the development who are supportive?
L1	DR. MARTIN: Did I tally?
L2	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You need to turn the
L3	microphone on.
L4	DR. MARTIN: I need clarity to the
L5	question, I'm sorry.
L6	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: You stated that 272
L7	residents, and we got the big folder, voiced
L8	opposition. I'm wondering whether, were there a number
L9	of people that you spoke with who were supportive of
20	the development?
21	DR. MARTIN: The support that I heard was
22	what you heard today, and so I did not tally the
23	number of persons who were in support, nor did I tally
24	the number of persons who were was it in favor or what
25	was his position.

1 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay, thank you. 2 DR. MARTIN: You are welcome. 3 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair? CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, Mr. Hood. 4 5 VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Let me just ask something of Dr. Martin. 6 7 You said you went door to door, you and, I can't remember who else you named, that you all went 8 9 door to door, and I applaud your efforts in doing 10 something that shows that you take a lot of initiative 11 in your neighborhood for doing this. But, let me ask 12 you, when you went door to door, did you have a 13 discussion or did you let people just read the 14 language that you have here on this three-sentence 15 petition, or did you have a discussion with each individual? 16 17 DR. MARTIN: I had a discussion, all of 18 those petitions don't represent just Oralisa, but I 19 even tallied which ones came through me, which ones 20 came through Dr. Kelly, which ones came through, I 21 think it was a Ms. Reed and someone else. I talk a 22 Okay. So, I tried to present to the signer what the issue was, I didn't just stick -- because this 23 24 happens to my people all the time, folk come in and

stick something in front of us and tell us sign. So,

1	I tried to present what I understood the issue to be,
2	and then I tried to succinctly put it on a sheet of
3	paper so that when there is a signature, if we had to
4	go to court, people would understand what they signed.
5	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Because again, when
6	I look at what I see here, it does not expound upon
7	what's actually happening. If I read this, I, too,
8	would be outraged, if I just read this. That's why I
9	wanted to know did you have a discussion.
10	DR. MARTIN: I did.
11	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay, thank you.
12	DR. MARTIN: I did.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else for the
14	panel?
15	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, I just, you
16	know, want to just make certain that, I mean you are
17	the messenger, you are the person that's, you know,
18	speaking to these individuals versus the Applicant or
19	the developer. So, I guess I'm just a bit leery up
20	here as relates to, you know, some of the methodology,
21	because I'm not certain I know exactly what you
22	presented to them, even beyond what Vice-Chair Hood
23	has said. Do you see what I mean?
24	DR. MARTIN: I do.
25	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: And, it's
ı	

DR. MARTIN: And, I --

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: -- excuse me, and,
Dr. Martin, I'm not -- I mean, I'm not going to
question, you know, your motives or anything, but I'm
just dealing with methodology, and I just want to -you know, because when you come up and say 272
residents, I need to understand fully how you got that
information and what was presented, because, you know,
it just calls into question process.

DR. MARTIN: Okay. Let me lay it out as succinctly as I can. Having gone through several meetings, be they ANC, little cluster group meetings with West*Group presenting images that we didn't understand, many people in the community not having even the language. If you ask them, they wouldn't know that we were in an R-1-B zone.

Okay. So, understanding that we were in trouble, that a monster was about to enter the community, okay, I didn't use that term "monster," I'm using it to you, okay, then it was important to go and first of all let the community know that the property had been sold, which many did not know. Okay. And then secondly, to let the community know that those of us within the 200 square foot radii received a letter that said the new owners wanted to change the zone.

Okay.

And so, then to define what that was, and then to say, in changing the zone we have been presented with several models. And so, several models meaning we want to move from single-family housing, single-detached homes, to townhouses, condominiums, I never used the word row houses, I should have used that, too. But anyway, and apartments, these apartments, condominiums, and that we, and I named us the citizens, are asking you, are you -- would you like to keep the zone as is, which would be single-family units, detached. Okay.

So, that's the content of the discussion.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else?

Mr. Turnbull.

COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Dr. Martin, do you think, do most people understand that the zoning change is just for the area in question, it doesn't affect the rest of the neighborhood, or were they concerned about that also? I mean, maybe -- it sounds like there's a lot of confusion.

DR. MARTIN: There is a lot of confusion by virtue of the fact that first of all many people had not heard of a PUD, they didn't know what that was.

That's number one. There's a lot of confusion because people were commenting on the PUD plan, the trees, whether McDonald's paper was going to fall in front of my house, never seen the schema of things which is what the Commission asked tonight. You asked, how does the big picture look? What does this mean? And so, yes, there's confusion, there's confusion because, first of all, a year goes by with discussion and no mention of a zone change, so when I did I was silenced. And then secondly, once there's the mention of the zone change, the education of what that means. See, you all are privy, because you do this, this is your profession, but for the community out there, the one thing we knew that if we keep the zoning as it is we could look and see across the street what looks like to my left, my right, in front of me and behind me. So, we understood that this particular project didn't fit us, that foreigners that come in, we called it an invasion. We don't have the language you have, but we knew it didn't fit, and they kept changing on us. So, one week we were responding to a

certain number of condominiums, and the next week we

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 were responding to something else. One week we were 2 responding to a park on the corner, and now we come 3 today and found out there's a dog park. They never 4 heard of a dog park before, and this is what's been happening to us consistently, and, you know what, we 5 feel violated. We really do. We feel violated, 6 7 because we are talking about people, not just the 8 materials, we're violated. 9 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Let me ask you 10 something. If the process is to continue, what 11 changes or what do you think the Applicant could 12 better present to you, how do you see this going 13 forward to better address your concerns? 14 DR. MARTIN: I think at this point, now 15 first I need to ask for a functioning definition. Are you asking me as an individual, are you asking in 16 17 light of the community, because I will answer you on 18 two levels, I promise you. 19 COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: I guess I just want 20 to see the needs of the community addressed here. 21 DR. MARTIN: Okay. In direct answer to your 22 question, the community has voiced the need for that 23 property be developed within the constraints of an R-24 1-B, so whatever the West*Group needs to do in order

for that to happen, then that's what we are open to.

When we asked them the possibility of
that, we need to back up to say initially there was an
option of a development within an R-1-B, as I
understand from Ms. Judi Jones, and somewhere or
another that dropped, so we didn't see that anymore.
So, we are going to all of these meetings
that we no longer have the option of an R-1-B in the
meeting. So, we are cut out, but we continue to go to
the meetings.
So, the Commission needs to be aware of
the fact, and it depends on who has the mic at the
time at the meeting, because some hands aren't
recognized, mine being one of them.
COMMISSIONER TURNBULL: Okay, thank you.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I had just one
question for Ms. Griffin. Did you have any accident
statistics that you could provide, or could you get
those, because you were mentioning the frequency of
accidents at New Hampshire and Rittenhouse, and DDOT
maintains statistics.
MO ODIERTNA NA LA LIBERTA DE LA
MS. GRIFFIN: No, no, I haven't got, I
don't have any. Since we are going to have another
don't have any. Since we are going to have another

1	that has it, and submit it to the record, that would
2	help just round out your testimony.
3	MS. JONES: Okay.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
5	Mr. Glasgow, any questions?
6	MR. GLASGOW: I think that what we'll do is
7	we'll cover a lot of these allegations next time.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's fine.
9	Commissioner Whiting, did you have any
10	questions? Okay.
11	Thanks to the panel very much.
12	Yes, sir.
13	MR. MARTIN: I want to know if it's clear
14	in my statement when I said I just learned today that
15	it's a 50-foot drop, I knew there was a slope back
16	there, I just want to make certain that
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You were saying you
18	didn't know
19	MR. MARTIN: I didn't know how much of
20	a slope it was.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: yes, I understood
22	that when you said it.
23	MR. MARTIN: I just wanted to clear that
24	up.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thanks for the

1	clarification.
2	MR. MARTIN: Thank you.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, thanks,
4	everyone.
5	Okay. Also on the witness list I have
6	Rodney Foxworth, representing the Lamond-Riggs
7	Citizens Association, Dr. Avis Kelly. Are you going
8	to testify? Okay, please come forward. Terry Goings,
9	for the Lamond CDC, Gloria Mobley.
10	You need to give the cards to the reporter
11	who is over here.
12	Mr. Foxworth, why don't you go ahead and
13	get started.
14	MR. FOXWORTH: Okay, good evening,
15	Commissioners, and thank you for this opportunity to
16	testify on behalf of the Lamond-Riggs Citizens
17	Association. I am Rodney Foxworth, President, and I
18	live at 5714 5th Street, N.E. I'm also an economic
19	development professional, having been the Manager of
20	an 11 state technical assistance project funded by the
21	Department of Justice for the National Congress for
22	Community Economic Development, that revitalize
23	communities across the country.
24	I've spent three years as a project
25	manager for the National League of Cities, managing a

project that provided assistance of non-profits and local governments across the country to revitalize communities.

And lastly, I spent three years as the Town Administrator for Bladensburg, Maryland and initiated and implemented their historic strategic planning process to revitalize the town.

I also have a Masters in Public Policy.

Although I did not submit my resume as part of my testimony, I hope that you will consider me as an expert witness on behalf of the community in opposition to the proposed development.

Since 1948, LRCA has represented all of Lamond-Riggs, and we have been active in everything from the proposed highway through our community in the 1970s, to building of a library, a rec center in the '80s, from issues of crime and co-sponsoring the citywide Youth Summit last year, to holding our first annual bazaar last Saturday, from advocating for a small aerial plan to guide overall development in Lamond-Riggs, and to working on proposed development projects like the West*Group PUD.

Although we acknowledge that The Jarvis and West*Group attended numerous community meetings to explain the proposed project, we still oppose the PUD.

1	We sent correspondence to the Zoning Commission early
2	this year opposing the project, based on land use
3	decisions and policy. Having done an analysis of the
4	PUD, along with Citizens Aware, Lamond Community
5	Action Group, these are two block associations of the
6	Lamond-Riggs Citizens Association, and the ANC 4B
7	Commission Bowser, opposition was not an emotional
8	response.
9	We did, however, state that we would
10	revisit that decision after reports from appropriate
11	City agencies were available, so that we could benefit
12	from their review and comments.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Foxworth, if you
14	are going to read your whole statement you are not
15	going to get through it, so could I ask you to kind of
16	hit the highlights?
17	MR. FOXWORTH: Sure.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
19	MR. FOXWORTH: We've done an analysis of
20	the reports from the City agencies, and we have some
21	comments about those reports.
22	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That would be great.
23	MR. FOXWORTH: With the fire and EMS, it
24	clearly states, and I quote, that "The turn rate of 20
25	feet is going to be somewhat tight, and it depends

upon parking. Residents of our community and residents of that development should not have to depend upon appropriate parking to get emergency services."

From the DDOT report, we don't see any evidence of similar proposals like this working in the District, and, in fact, when the developer mentioned this model really couldn't cite two or three examples of where this has worked in Washington, D.C.

before the bridge work, and, in fact, DDOT's traffic study only includes the four streets around the development. It doesn't go four blocks over to New Hampshire and N. Capitol Street, which is a major thoroughfare, and it doesn't go 12 blocks over to Riggs Road and New Hampshire Avenue, which is also a major thoroughfare. So, we get traffic jammed up in the morning coming through our neighborhoods, and I live like four blocks away from the project. And, in fact, DDOT confirmed today that their study only includes the four blocks that are adjacent to the actual project itself.

With the DHCD report, there's no way that the density of this proposed development replicates the massing and density of the housing units in

1 Lamond-Riggs. There are no townhouses and condos in our community, none at all. 2 3 In terms of the public spaces serving as 4 public front yards, until there is a codified 5 homeowners agreement these are public spaces in a public development funded by -- I'm sorry, these are 6 7 private spaces in a private development funded by 8 private funds. The number of proposed units that are 9 affordable are also insufficient. We understand that 10 11 projects like this in the City, the City considers 12 about 20 percent as an appropriate affordable housing 13 number. 14 In addition, if this was raised to 28 15 units, then they should not be limited to the townhouses, the affordable units should be spread out 16 17 throughout the development. 18 I'm going to skip some of the **WASI** 19 concerns that's in my testimony. Let me get to the 20 Office of Planning concerns. 21 Just as the Office of Planning and DDOT 22 wants to make sure that the legal language is there 23 for the homeowners association, regarding the management and infrastructure, similar concerns need 24

to be placed with the public place. I think some of

1 the Commissioners mentioned that earlier today as well. 2 3 The project is still too dense, and that's 4 been echoed by several of the Commissioners. 5 project was proposed at 199 units, 187 units really doesn't make any significant difference in the 6 7 project. The project does not comply with Sections 8 410 and 225 sections of the Zoning Regulations. 9 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Would you just wrap it 11 up, and we'll read the detail in your written 12 statement. 13 MR. FOXWORTH: Sure. 14 We see no significant community benefits 15 in the proposal. The sheet of the community benefits were offered as talking points by the developer, not 16 ever a firm offer in any of the meetings that I 17 18 attended. And so, we know, therefore, developments 19 like this, perhaps, \$400,000 is a more appropriate figure from estimated home sales totaling half a 2.0 21 billion dollars, or close to a billion dollars in 22 total home sales, \$400,000 only represents like .053 23 percent of the total realized as sales. The last point I'd like to make is that if 24 25 the developer offers additional materials for

1 consideration of the PUD, the Lamond-Riggs Citizens 2 Association would like to have a chance to look at any 3 additional materials that are being offered, and have 4 a chance to offer some public testimony for the record 5 as well. 6 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. 7 Dr. Kelly. DR. KELLY: Good evening, ladies and 8 gentlemen. My name is Avis Kelly. I am a resident of 9 10 the Lamond-Riggs community. My property adjoins the 11 property in question, and I am directly affected by 12 this project. Hence, my need to speak to you today. 13 I am here to appeal the Zoning Commission 14 to deny the request of the West*Group in their 15 application for a zone change from an R-1 to R-5-B. I see this building, this project, as I 16 17 have recently lost my husband, and because of that I 18 was not able to be in on the early planning and 19 presentations that were made by the West*Group. However, I did receive nine letters from the Holland 20 21 Company, stating their decision to change the zoning 22 from R-1 to R-5. And, as soon as I saw that 23 communication, I started right away to make a 24 petition. 25 I am a citizen of the Lamond-Riggs

community. I do not want the zone changed from R-1 -- I want the zoning to stay R-1-B, I do not want the zone changed.

And we, Dr. Martin joined me in the solicitation of support for this petition, hence the number that we acquired.

I see this project as an invasion, I really feel invaded. As I look out, I look right out into the property, and I see the value that the West*Group in their presentation places on the greenery, how it means much to them. And, in the same way it means much to me, too. Where I am placing that project is a big wall right in front of me, and the back of these houses 30 feet in front of me, that's what I'm getting, instead of the greenery. therapy for me, and I didn't want to be selfish, I don't want to be selfish and say I'm looking out for myself alone, but I got around to many of the neighbors and I realized that they shared the same view as myself, and hence, I wanted to go out more and talk about it, and I tried to talk up for them because they asked me to.

And, it reminds me of a piece of property that I have in Tacoma Park. I have 1,200 feet of empty space in the basement, I tried to convert that

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	-
2	- I petitioned to convert that spot to apartments, but
3	it was turned down because Tacoma Park cannot afford
4	to have anymore accommodation, they can't afford
5	anymore accommodation, hence I cannot convert it.
б	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I need your closing
7	thought now.
8	DR. KELLY: This property is the same as
9	that piece of property I have there, it is a big piece
10	of greenery, it cannot we can't afford to have
11	anything there, because the place is already
12	congested. In the morning, it is so dense it's a
13	traffic jam every morning along New Hampshire Avenue.
14	And, I feel that we ought to take this
15	into consideration, and we should not approve this
16	petition.
17	Thank you.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you very much.
19	Mr. Goings.
20	MR. GOINGS: Good evening. My name is
21	Terry Goings, and I am a member of the Lamond
22	community. I've been living in the Lamond community
23	now for 47 years. I was raised and born three, and
24	I'm now living in the house that I grew up in.

Really, I'm here to talk about the

community benefits, where they have been proposed for the community benefits. If nothing else, I would ask that you all reject this proposal just on community benefits alone. I don't think there's enough community benefits for the size project that they are proposing.

Another thing, I don't think that the proper people was in the negotiation for these community benefits, even though they proposed a community benefit package, I think it should have been more leaders of the community in here.

While I'm looking at the Coolidge High School, and here I am PTA President of Coolidge, and I wasn't in the negotiation, and they say they are going to give us 14 computers, and we are not able to receive 14 computers at this time because of electrical capacity. So, therefore, the proper people were not in the negotiation of these community benefits.

One thing that I'm thinking also is that the whole plan should have been negotiated a little bit different, that's why we are having the problem that we are having now. I'm believing that the West*Group probably went to too many people, that it should have been an ad hoc committee, maybe they should have took one representative from each

1 community group, sat down with them and negotiated, or 2 come to one meeting. 3 Now, Ms. Jones was having a community 4 meeting with the West*Group. She is the ANC -affected ANC Commissioner, and she was having a 5 community meeting with the West*Group, and was 6 7 inviting everybody in. I believe the problem came and the 8 9 West*Group was trying to accommodate all these small community groups that we do have here, so I've got to 10 commend them for that, but I think that was the 11 12 mistake when they decided to go to all these single groups to negotiate. So, if you go to ten different 13 14 groups you are going to get ten different ideas, and 15 that's where the problem come from. I believe they need to come back to the 16 17 community, and I believe that they can negotiate 18 something that community can live with, and, of 19 course, as it stands right now, the community is not 20 going to be able to live with this, it's going to be 21 too compact of a community, and I don't believe that's 22 what you all want. 23 And, that's my testimony right there. 24 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you very much. 25 Ms. Mobley.

1 MS. MOBLEY: Good evening. My name is 2 Gloria I. Mobley. I reside at 6030 Sligo Mill Road, 3 N.E., Washington, D.C. 20011. I am within the 200 4 square foot radius that people have been talking 5 about. I'm a native Washingtonian, one of four 6 7 generations, and I have lived on Sligo Mill Road for 48 years. Believe it or not, I'm 52. Okay, so let's 8 9 get that cleared up right now. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You did swear in. 10 11 MR. MOBLEY: I did swear that in the 12 beginning, it's all in the genes. 13 In addition to being pretty much -- my 14 family moved to Sligo Mill Road when I was four years 15 old, and we were the first Black family, African American family, in the 6000 block of Sligo Mill Road. 16 17 So, I've watched the community evolve, develop, 18 change, and change is not necessarily a bad thing, and I do not wish or want the Commissioners to think that 19 2.0 I'm against change. 21 Everybody, and I concur, with the three 22 major issues that you've heard, which are density, the impact on the community, as well as the lack of 23 communication with community members. 24 25 In the time that I've known about this, I

admit, I have not been able to attend meetings, and that's primarily because I'm caring for my 83-year old mother who has significant health concerns.

As a result, though, I have had an opportunity to get a few bits of information, primarily, through Judi Jones, and through the one correspondence that I got, or my mother and I received, as a result of the letter that you talked about with the zoning change. That's, basically, the only thing that I've heard.

There are some fundamental flaws with respect to the design, and with all due respect to the Office of Planning I think you all need to go back out there and look at the community.

At the intersection of New Hampshire and Rittenhouse, not only is there a row of three houses, there's also a bus stop, and if you are talking about trying to increase the number of houses there, as well as the green space, and you are taking away the green space that people would have had to wait for the buses, that is a safety concern.

We have several charter schools in the neighborhood. With the density of this particular property, what will happen is that a lot of the children will not have a safe way to go to and from

the bus stop. Specifically, I'm referring to the bus
stop at Peabody and New Hampshire Avenue, and there's
also another bus stop between excuse me, let me
verify, there are three bus stops between New
Hampshire and Rittenhouse up to approximately New
Hampshire and Oneida Street, and it's Oneida, we don't
use the Native American pronunciation of Oneida, and
it's Quackenbos. Okay? Just want to clarify that.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
MS. MOBLEY: Okay. So, I'm concerned about
the issues of density, because it's not only traffic,
as you said, Commissioner, it's not just building
mass, it's people mass, and what that number of people
will do to change the character of the community is
significantly so that I am urging you to reject the
proposal.
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
MS. MOBLEY: I do could I answer a
question, because someone asked what would we want.
What we want is am I allowed to respond to that?
CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: As long as you keep it
brief.
MS. MOBLEY: Okay then. I say we don't
need a dog park. Most of us walk around in the
neighborhood, and the only people who are going to

1 benefit from the dog park would probably be three or four houses that are on that side of Peabody and 2 Chillum, and that's it. 3 4 The other thing is, I also have a survey, or not a survey, a petition, and it includes 20 5 individuals, my neighbors, I walked door to door, and 6 7 I have what I said to them, and I also presented to them from the zoning application, I told them exactly 8 9 what was on the notice, so people would know what I 10 was talking about. And, I didn't just stuck it under 11 their noses, I explained to them what it was, and I 12 got 20 signatures. If I had more daylight I probably 13 would have gotten more. 14 Out of those 20 only two declined to sign. 15 Okay? And, I will give it to the Secretary, and I have copies if you wanted them, too. 16 17 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That would be great, yes, that would be very helpful. 18 19 All right. Questions for the panel. 20 Mr. Jeffries? 21 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Mr. Foxworth, I'm 22 sorry I had stepped out when you started your 23 testimony, but two really quick questions. One, you stated that there were no townhouses or condos 24 25 anywhere in the community.

1	MR. FOXWORTH: That's correct.
2	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: So, in a four-block
3	radius, or when you say community, how big is that?
4	MR. FOXWORTH: The Lamond-Riggs community.
5	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay.
6	MR. FOXWORTH: That covers the entire
7	development and X number of blocks on all sides, there
8	are no condos, nor townhouses.
9	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. And then,
10	the second question I had is that you mentioned here
11	under the community benefits in the PUD, you didn't
12	think there was any significant community benefits,
13	and then you listed that you thought the home sales
14	were likely to rate close to \$1 billion. You should,
15	you know, probably circle back to the developer, I'm
16	pretty certain that if that's the number they are
17	giving, but you might want to circle back if you are
18	really trying to figure out, you know, community
19	benefits as a subset of what the intended sales will
20	be.
21	MR. FOXWORTH: All I did was take 189 units
22	times average sale price of \$400,000, and that came up
23	to be \$750 million, unless I missed a zero.
24	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, yes.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else?

1	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Madam Chair, yes,
2	I also wanted to ask Mr. Foxworth, the Lamond-Riggs
3	Citizens Association, do you meet in the Lamond-Riggs
4	Library?
5	MR. FOXWORTH: No, we outgrew that several
6	years ago. We actually meet at the Faith Moravian
7	Church.
8	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. So, we have
9	a citizens association in Lamond-Riggs and you have a
10	civic association in Lamond-Riggs, right?
11	MR. FOXWORTH: No, it's the Lamond-Riggs
12	Citizens Association.
13	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay.
14	MR. FOXWORTH: Some of our predecessors may
15	have been called civic association, but the name
16	changed in like 5748, so it is now citizens
17	association.
18	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Okay. What are
19	your boundaries?
20	MR. FOXWORTH: We go from all the way
21	behind the Lamond Rec Center, I don't know the street
22	names, but Terry Goings, he knows, in general, better
23	than I do, could I ask him to respond?
24	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Sure, just give me
25	your boundaries.

1	MR. GOINGS: Yes, they are starting from
2	Lamond area, it runs down the B&O Railroad, it runs
3	down to Underwood Place to the B&O Railroad, down the
4	B&O Railroad all the way to, I think that's South
5	Dakota Avenue, and it runs down South Dakota Avenue to
6	Fort Totten Metro. The Fort Totten Metro cuts off
7	there, and it runs down to the Ward 5 area down there
8	to
9	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Yes, I know where
10	it stops right there, I know where that is.
11	MR. GOINGS: Back to Eastern Avenue, down
12	Eastern Avenue, all of that is considered part of our
13	service area.
14	VICE-CHAIRPERSON HOOD: Right, okay, I'm
15	familiar with that end.
16	Okay, and, Mr. Goings, I appreciate, I had
17	heard that about Coolidge High School, I'm glad you
18	brought that up. Thank you.
19	Thank you, Madam Chair.
20	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you.
21	Dr. Kelly, you mentioned that you were
22	immediately adjacent to the development, but you
23	didn't say precisely where you live. Could you just
24	give us your address?
25	DR. KELLY: Oh, I'm sorry, I'm at 5900 New

1	Hampshire Avenue, that's at the corner of Oneida and
2	New Hampshire.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, great, thank
4	you.
5	Anyone else on the Commission, questions
6	for the panel?
7	Mr. Glas
8	MR. FOXWORTH: I'm sorry, I just wanted to
9	make sure that the Commissioner realized that the ANCs
10	did take a vote on this, and that vote was no.
11	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, we understand.
12	MR. FOXWORTH: Okay.
13	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And, we also
14	understood that they wanted time to digest additional
15	information, which is why we are organizing it this
16	way.
17	MR. FOXWORTH: As do we all.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
19	Mr. Glasgow, did you have any questions?
20	MR. GLASGOW: Just one clarification. I
21	didn't hear that Mr. Foxworth was accepted as an
22	expert in any particular field.
23	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: No, he he I
24	don't think a non-party can even proffer an expert.
25	MR. GLASGOW: Okay.

1	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, that's fine,
2	although we do appreciate knowing your background. I
3	didn't know that.
4	Commissioner Whiting, did you have any
5	questions?
6	Ms. Jefferson, any questions for the
7	panel?
8	Okay, thank you all very much.
9	Okay, I also have Floyd Smith and
10	Josephine Smith on the witness list, if they'd like to
11	testify. If you'd like to testify.
12	Anyone else who would like to testify in
13	opposition, now is the time to come forward.
14	Anyone else?
15	So, Mr. Smith, you are flying solo?
16	MR. SMITH: What?
17	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Are you flying solo?
18	MR. SMITH: Yes.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Please, go
20	ahead.
21	MR. SMITH: I live at 51 Peabody Street,
22	N.E. I am directly in front of the main building
23	where the road goes up is my house.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
25	MR. SMITH: I listened to one of the people

1 that was here, and my house sits where he said the other -- he's turning houses, their backs to me. 2 3 When they talked to us before, they said 4 the houses would all be toward Peabody Street. 5 they put the houses to my -- if they will have the wall in front of me, the back, I thought they were 6 7 going to put the houses out toward Peabody Street. I 8 understand now that they are going to put them -- the 9 backs to me. And, he was saying that it's what it is, 10 11 it's the front of my house that they are talking 12 They were very insensitive to what I see. Do you understand me? 13 14 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. 15 MR. SMITH: I know they've got the slide rules and they do all the things, but they are turning 16 17 these houses against me. Do you know what I mean? 18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I understand your 19 concern completely. 20 MR. SMITH: Yes. And, the insensitive 21 nature of his statement bothers me. 22 That's all I want to say. 23 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Smith, could you 24 just describe, if I want to look on a plat so I can 25 see specifically where you live, just so I'm sure I

1	understand, so orient us with Chillum Place.
2	MR. SMITH: I live at 1st and Peabody.
3	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Oh, you are at 1st and
4	Peabody, so you are right in that corner right before
5	the
6	MR. SMITH: I'm right across the street
7	from the entrance to the building.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I see, oh, okay, okay,
9	okay. Okay. I believe the side will be shown, you
10	will see a side, not a back, just so you understand.
11	No, I just wanted you to understand.
12	And, the Applicant can show you more
13	explicitly what that elevation would look like. Okay?
14	Any questions for Mr. Smith? Any
15	questions?
16	Okay, thank you very much.
17	MR. GLASGOW: Okay, we'll go ahead and
18	reply, because that's a front.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: That's fine. And, did
20	you want to do that tonight, or do you want to wait
21	and do that after the ANC has a presentation?
22	MR. GLASGOW: It probably makes more sense
23	after the ANC.
24	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think that's I
25	think that's best.

I did just want to say something, because I know folks are going to be weighing in on the community benefits proffer, and I just want to remind everyone that, you know, a lot of these are open-ended kinds of contributions, which is not what we favor. We don't favor contributions to be -- the use of which to be determined by, you know, a community center's management, you know, we want to see something tangible. So, just as you work through this with the community, I would just urge you to make it more definite. And, Ms. Whiting, I'm just going to ask you to come forward for a minute, because I do want to remind folks, you know, clearly we've heard from a lot of disparate groups, I do want to remind folks that it's the ANC to which we give great weight, and the ANC will have an additional opportunity to, you know, to digest this material. I just wanted to ask if you would put the time, date, location of your July meeting on the record, so that everybody here can come and join you if they would like. MS. WHITING: Our July meeting is July 27th, at 7:00 p.m., at Paul Public Charter School. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And, do you have an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	August meeting?
2	MS. WHITING: We are off the month of
3	August.
4	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. So, the
5	opportunity that they have to influence the ANC will
6	be the 27th of July.
7	MS. WHITING: Yes, that's correct.
8	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay, I just wanted to
9	have that on the record.
10	MS. WHITING: Well, the ANC has already
11	taken a vote.
12	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I know that, but I
13	assume you are going to digest this additional
14	material and, perhaps, revisit your position, since
15	your position was contingent on having this material.
16	I'm not presupposing what the position will be, it's
17	just that it was pretty explicit that the Commission
18	wanted this additional material before taking a final
19	position.
20	MS. WHITING: Some of the Commissioners
21	voiced that they had not heard, because they don't
22	live within the surrounding area, that they had not
23	attended some of the meetings where DDOT or the Office
24	of Planning had did their final presentations.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I see you as

1	pulling all of it together, so that's why I was urging
2	people to come and, you know, pros and cons, just come
3	and make sure you all heard it.
4	MS. WHITING: Okay, thank you.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.
6	Mr. Glasgow, anything before we adjourn?
7	Okay, I'd just remind folks then that we
8	will reconvene for a short session to hear the ANCs
9	presentation and their cross examination of the
10	Applicant's witnesses on September 7th, which is a
11	Thursday, and we'll start that session at 7:30,
12	because we do have a hearing before that at 6:30 on
13	another matter.
14	So, I thank you all for staying with us
15	this evening, and we are now adjourned.
16	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was
17	concluded at 10:13 p.m.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
1	1